



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

<https://archive.org/details/jesusofhistoryre00unse>

THESES
1935

Volume IV



PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

C O N T E N T S

FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

The Jesus of History Interpreted for Today
Cyril Merle Hicks

A Critical Evaluation of the Contribution of
Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the Interpretation
of the Fourth Gospel
Bertha Ellen Pease

Predestination and Incarnation
Fred Sheridan Stripp

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY

The Social and Religious Origins of the Negro Church
Daniel Grafton Hill

The Contribution of the New Physics to Religious Thought
Paul Faulkner Tjensvold

THE JESUS OF HISTORY
REINTERPRETED FOR TODAY

Cyril M. Hicks
B. R. E. Boston University

Thesis
Submitted in the
Department of New Testament
in partial fulfillment of the require-
ments for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity
in the Pacific School of Religion.

1935

OUTLINE

BOOK I Introduction.

Chapter I

- I. The Purpose of the Study. Pages 1-5
 - A. To know the conditions in which Jesus grew up.
 - B. To estimate the effect of these conditions upon his life and teachings.
 - C. To re-evaluate the ideals of Jesus in the light of the modern day.

Chapter II

Method of Procedure and Sources.

- I. Examination of Sources and Their Value. Page 6
 - A. Old Testament apocrypha writings. Pages 7-8
 - B. The Apocalypses. Page 8
 - C. Josephus. Pages 8-9
 - D. Rabbinical Writings. Page 10
- II. Examination of the Synoptic Records. Page 11
- III. Consideration of Works of Contemporary Authors. Page 11
- IV. Summary. Page 12.

Chapter III

The Geography of Palestine Pages 13-16

BOOK II Political Background of Jesus' Life.

Chapter IV

Palestine as a Political Battleground

- I. Palestine during the struggle between Syria and Egypt. Pages 17-19
- II. The Maccabean Regime. Pages 19-21
- III. The Advent of Rome. Pages 21-23
- IV. Palestine in Jesus' Day. Pages 23-25
- V. Summary of Political Situation. Pages 25-30

Chapter V

Economic and Social Conditions in Palestine

- I. Trades and Occupations of Jews. Pages 31-35
- II. Economic Divisions among the People. Pages 35-40
- III. Social Life in Palestine. Pages 40-42
- IV. Educational and Intellectual Life. Pages 42-46
 - A. Population.
 - B. Manner of Living.
 - C. Home and Family Life.
 - D. Means of Social Expression.
- V. Summary of Economic and Social Life. Pages 47-48

OUTLINE

BOOK I Introduction.

Chapter I

- I. The Purpose of the Study. Pages 1-5
 - A. To know the conditions in which Jesus grew up.
 - B. To estimate the effect of these conditions upon his life and teachings.
 - C. To re-evaluate the ideals of Jesus in the light of the modern day.

Chapter II

Method of Procedure and Sources.

- I. Examination of Sources and Their Value. Page 6
 - A. Old Testament apocrypha writings. Pages 7-8
 - B. The Apocalypses. Page 8
 - C. Josephus. Pages 8-9
 - D. Rabbinical Writings. Page 10
- II. Examination of the Synoptic Records. Page 11
- III. Consideration of Works of Contemporary Authors. Page 11
- IV. Summary. Page 12.

Chapter III

The Geography of Palestine Pages 13-16

BOOK II Political Background of Jesus' Life.

Chapter IV

Palestine as a Political Battleground

- I. Palestine during the struggle between Syria and Egypt. Pages 17-19
- II. The Maccabean Regime. Pages 19-21
- III. The Advent of Rome. Pages 21-23
- IV. Palestine in Jesus' Day. Pages 23-25
- V. Summary of Political Situation. Pages 25-30

Chapter V

Economic and Social Conditions in Palestine

- I. Trades and Occupations of Jews. Pages 31-35
- II. Economic Divisions among the People. Pages 35-40
- III. Social Life in Palestine. Pages 40-42
- IV. Educational and Intellectual Life. Pages 42-46
 - A. Population.
 - B. Manner of Living.
 - C. Home and Family Life.
 - D. Means of Social Expression.
- V. Summary of Economic and Social Life. Pages 47-48

Chapter VI

Moral and Religious Life in Palestine

I.	The Temple and its Priesthood.	Pages 49-51
II.	The Synagogue and its Uses.	Pages 51-52
III.	Religious Beliefs of Groups within Judaism.	
	A. The Zealots.	Pages 52-53
	B. The Essenes.	Pages 53-57
	C. The Pharisees.	Pages 57-58
	D. The Sadducees.	Pages 58-60
IV.	Beliefs of Judaism as a Whole.	Pages 60-62
V.	Summary of Moral and Religious Life in Palestine.	Pages 62-63

BOOK III Jesus in His Day and Ours.

Chapter VII

Significance of His Teachings

I.	The Kingdom of God.	
	A. The Expectation of the Kingdom.	Pages 64-66
	B. Messianic Expectation.	Pages 65-66
	C. How and When the Kingdom was to Come.	Pages 66-71
	D. Qualities of the Kingdom.	Pages 71-74
II.	Specific Teachings.	
	A. In the Realm of Politics.	Pages 74-79
	B. In the Realm of Social and Economic Life.	Pages 79-86
III.	Conclusion.	Pages 87-88

THE JESUS OF HISTORY REINTERPRETED FOR TODAY

BOOK I Introduction.

Chapter I

Purpose of our Study

The desire to know Jesus is fundamental in the thinking of many people. Many have been the attempts to know him. The conclusions drawn from this age-long study have been varied and diffuse. "Jesus is the enigma of the centuries. What to make of him has been a puzzle to both saints and skeptics. Appraisals of his personality have ranged all the way from zero to infinity. At one extreme a small group of valiant doubters has proclaimed his absolute non-existence in either time or eternity.....at the other extreme stands a vast throng of the faithful who have not only affirmed the reality of Jesus the man but have pledged their belief in his perfect godhood."¹ How then shall we stand; with the skeptics on the left or with the believers on the right? It is not the purpose of this thesis to prove the existence of Jesus. Proofs there are and they are the basic assumptions of this study. We also must recognize other critical problems, and grant their existence, for the purpose is rather to see Jesus in the light of his own daily living and to evaluate the background of his existence. To know the conditions in Palestine under which Jesus grew up; to estimate the effect of these conditions upon his life and teachings; to evaluate these findings in relation to their utility for our present day: these are the purposes of this thesis.

These purposes become increasingly more important

because of the conceptions that have grown up around the person of Jesus and his life upon earth; conceptions many of which are absolutely foreign to his ideals or his purposes. "Who do men say that I am?" This is a question to which many answers have been given. It thus becomes essential for us to know what Jesus really felt regarding himself and to determine how his beliefs were effected by his environment. The Church, through the years, has glorified the earthly Jesus into an eternal and spiritual Christ. This glorified Jesus has overshadowed the Man of Nazareth, he who walked with men and talked with them. This process of idealization began soon after the Resurrection, when the disciples desirous of defending their Master and of justifying their own faith in him as the Messiah, set out to glorify and sanctify his teachings and personality. As a result many of the actual events and details of Jesus' life upon this earth have not been recorded and modern Christians have almost lost sight of Jesus, the Man of Nazareth. This process of idealization gathered momentum with the advent of new disciples from among the Greeks, Romans, Gauls and Britons. Those who had known and seen Jesus in the flesh were now rapidly disappearing and thus the men who could have given an accurate description of the sayings and teachings and personality of Jesus left only fragments, so far as we know, to tell of his life upon this earth. In the course of centuries it has become easy and oftentimes highly desirable to divest Jesus of his Palestinian garments and clothe him with the styles and thought patterns of nations which are far removed from

the center of his earthly activity. Thus it has come about that Jesus, a Jewish artisan, rejected, despised by his own people and slain by the Romans, is remembered and worshiped today by a world-wide Christendom.

The ever increasing intensity and complexity of life within Protestantism today has had a tendency to reclothe Jesus in many different robes and invest him with many ideas peculiar only to its particular purpose. Sects and denominations seize upon some phase of his life or some utterance of his and transform it to meet their especial purpose. Jesus to some has become a physical healer, to others the Saviour who died for the sins of all men, and yet others perceive him to be only a great man. He has been made by others the voice of authority for a new social order which is yet to be realized, and to them he is the supreme social reformer. Yet others make of him the model for pacificism, while the opponents of peace, in the pacifistic form at least, find him to be the ideal belligerent. In short, whatever one imagines the ideal Christian to be, Jesus has come to be just such a type of personality.

All of these may be and probably were attributes of his own great personality, but what is the background out of which his thoughts and activities grew and which of the aforementioned qualities is of supreme importance for our thinking and living in this varied life of ours? Protestantism lacks the churchly and ecclesiastical authority of our Catholic brethern and it becomes increasingly important that our Protestant faith shall speak authoritatively regarding the life and teachings of Jesus. These are times when men

and women must know what Jesus thought and said regarding the issues of economic and social life which confront us on every hand, times when they must find an authority for their faith and its twin attribute Christian social action. The Church of Jesus Christ must fulfill these needs and equip herself so that she can speak authoritatively.

It thus becomes increasingly necessary that we clearly differentiate the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith. If Jesus is to win the respect of men and women today he must stand forth in all his glory for what he was and must be divested of all the intellectual and denominational trappings which have been placed on him throughout the years. It will be impossible for him to thrive in our present civilization if his life and teachings cannot stand the white light of historical research. Jesus can survive this investigation, many of his robal accouterments cannot. It is constantly becoming more apparent that Jesus, the Man of Nazareth, is a much different person from the dressed up Jesus of the twentieth century Church.

"The truth is, Jesus Christ cannot be ignored. Nobody seems to find it possible to let him alone. He is still Master. The records of his life are very scanty, yet the central figure of the story stands out clear in every reading of the scattered memorabilia of those who knew him. Born nineteen hundred years ago, living a life human as our own, he is the great teacher in all things that come within the realm of the spiritual and his teach-

ing has revolutionized our thought of God. Living in an age that was simple as compared with our complex civilization, he yet dominates our thought on all social relationships. A Jew of the first century, his teaching is as fresh and wholesome today as when he first taught his little company of followers. Homely and plain of sense in his speech, so that the common people heard him gladly, he yet charms the poets of every age, who find in his vivid teaching, beauties of thought and expression at once their delight and their despair. Crucified as a criminal, he has been worshiped for centuries as Very God."²

If we are to evaluate this historic Jesus for the religion of today, an escape must first be made from the confusion which so certainly prevails regarding his actual life and pronouncements. We must cease making him the sponsor for our own ideals unless the facts warrant it. Custom has so long made him the champion of our ideals that it is difficult to thread back through the maze of early historical material to find the true person of Jesus and thus evaluate his teachings for the present day. Jesus was a man of his times, he thought as his own people thought, he revered many of the things his own people loved, he visioned a great kingdom of brotherhood and love which would transcend all material and transient things; this is the Jesus that we must attempt to find, if we would understand him and make him intellectually acceptable in this twentieth century.

Chapter IIMethod of Procedure and Sources

The two hundred years preceding the birth of Jesus were momentous ones for they cradled many of the political, economic and religious ideas that were prevalent in his time. There was much literary activity during this period. The great mass of apocalyptic literature came into being from the years 200-150 B.C. The Apocalypse of Enoch is a fruitful source of knowledge for the inner life of the Jewish nation. It reflects the thoughts and hopes of the people from 170 B.C. to the early part of the first century B. C. This book among others had a tremendous influence upon the writers of the New Testament. It is without a rival as a history of doctrinal development during the first two pre-Christian centuries. The Church Fathers considered it as important as the Canonical books. Its aim was in common with all Apocalyptic Literature, to show that despite the suffering and distress of the faithful, throughout the years of captivity and the sporadic wars and rebellions of the first and second centuries B.C., God's righteousness would yet be vindicated and the oppressors of the Jews overthrown. The apocalyptic views of the people varied, having almost as many divisions and shades of meaning as modern Protestantism, but they were all agreed on one thing, that the deliverance would come; a deliverance which would once again put Israel in a position of supremacy. The form of that deliverance and the time of its advent were ideas which made for a wide variety of opinion.

These writings are important for their influence upon later authors and as a background for the eschatological thinking of Jesus and his contemporaries.

Old Testament Apocrypha Writings.

There came into being also in this period a group of apocrypha writings. The works of this period must not be confused with the New Testament apocrypha books which came at a later time. These Old Testament apocrypha so-called, were those not accepted as sufficiently good or sufficiently early for inclusion in the formation of the Canon. Some of our present scriptural books came near being rejected. Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon were objects of much debate before their ultimate inclusion in the Canon. Some of the Old Testament apocrypha books have great merit, not only from an historical but from an ethical, moral and spiritual viewpoint as well.

Chief of the books of this period are Ecclesiasticus (The Wisdom of Ben Sirach) and First Maccabees, a history of the Jewish Wars under the Maccabees. The latter is distinctly valuable as a source for a certain part of the Jewish struggle under the Maccabean leadership. It covers the period 175-135 B.C. and is fairly accurate in its chronological data. Its narrative is concerned with the war annals and leadership of Judas Maccabeus. Second Maccabees is not directly related to the first book although it does cover the first fifteen years of the same period. It is an abridged edition of the work of Jason of Cyrene. The author has included the

five books of Jason into one of his own. These sources are also valuable as background material, as they portray a part of the struggle of the Jews for liberty, a struggle which naturally reflects the thinking of the period.

Other apocrypha are, The Wisdom of Solomon, Judith and Tobit. These and the others of this group which have been considered are important enough to be included among the holy books of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Apocalypses

The books within this classification are those that have a false authorship ascribed to them. They are products of the period from 170 to 135 B.C. Their authorship was often ascribed to the great heroes of Judaism, thereby the true author hoped to gain recognition for them, as well as protection for himself. They are polemics against heathenism and insist upon an absolute separation of the Jews from the Gentiles. They are, in the second place, briefs of Jewish propaganda and lastly, they contain revelations regarding the final state of supremacy which will come upon the release of the Israelites from their oppressors. The Book of Jubilees is a primitive story written from the standpoint of the law. The Letter of Aristeas, the Books of Adam and Eve and the Martyrdom of Isaiah are sacred legends of the period. The Psalms of Solomon are a collection emanating from the mind of an unknown author or authors. Fourth Maccabees and the "Pirke Aboth" are ethical and wisdom literature. These are important as source material for the period because

of the polemical and national nature of their contents.

Josephus

By far the most outstanding and most complete source for the period prior to the time of Jesus, as well as throughout his life, up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in 66 A. D. is Josephus. His writings are not always true to facts as he wrote for purposes of propaganda. Josephus, although a Jew, was received in Roman circles and became the chief historian for the period. His aim was to glorify his own nation and as a result the history of the Jews is invested with a halo of romance. Because of the political implications of the Messianic hope and the rebellions which it inspired, the author passes over it in absolute silence. It was his ever constant wish to represent his people as friendly to Rome. Any trouble that arose was not the fault of the people as a whole, but merely the agitation of a few fanatics. In these directions and for these purposes many of the statements of Josephus were distorted and thus present a biased picture. Nevertheless, the works of Josephus are a constant and an invaluable source for the period of Jesus life, as well as those years preceding his advent.

Josephus was dependent upon some sources, fragments of which are extant. Strabo, the historian, was his main source for the period 135-37 B.C. He culls from this author the passages that have reference to Palestine. Nicolaus Damascenus, the friend and counselor of Herod, is his chief source for the post-biblical period. In his

"Jewish Antiquities" Josephus attempts to give the history of the Jewish race from Adamic times to the year 63 A.D. This work contains twenty books, the last eight of which deal with the period directly preceding and including the time of Jesus. The "Jewish Wars" represent his attempt to chronicle the struggle of the Jews for independence from the time of the Maccabees to the destruction of Jerusalem. This historian is an invaluable source, but his particular bias and purpose must be taken into consideration if his data is to be accurate and usable.

Rabbinical Writings.

The Rabbinical writings of the period are another source which helps to give the proper background for Jesus and the thinking of the Jews of his day. Judaism had certain definite dogmas, although Burton Scott Easton in his book, "Christ in the Gospels" says, "if we really wish to understand Judaism we must rid ourselves resolutely of such presuppositions" as that Israel had a definite system of theology. But to its dogmas, Judaism clung tenaciously: God is one, he has created the universe, he has chosen Israel and has given her the Torah. (Law) He has prepared for Israel a future. Without these beliefs there could be no Judaism strictly speaking.

These Rabbinical sources are invaluable as a background for Jewish national and legal thinking. In using them two questions must be kept constantly in mind: How far does the teaching of the Rabbis of the period about which they are writing agree with the teaching of the

Rabbis of Jesus day? How far did the teaching of the Rabbis of Jesus day control Judaism as a whole?

Examination of the Synoptic Records

Another source, and of course a very important one is the Gospels, written by either eye-witnesses of the events of the Master's life or by authors who were in communication with the evangelists that walked with Jesus. These men have sent down to posterity the most complete collection of the sayings and work of Jesus, a collection that will be indispensable for our study. The Synoptic problem must be recognized and taken into consideration, but a complete analysis of it is not necessary for our purpose. The authorship of some of the gospels and the authenticity of some of the sayings and events are much in question, but there is a basic content which will serve as an invaluable source.

The Works of Contemporary Authorities.

The secondary sources must of course be taken into consideration, works of the New Testament scholars of our day. Their exhaustive examinations of the above mentioned primary materials, as well as their own appreciative work must be taken into account. They have rendered a valuable service in making it easier for us to get back to the truth in the life of Jesus. Their contributions have done much to make his life intellectually acceptable to the twentieth century.

Summary.

If then, we are to get back to the real Jesus and understand what he really said and did and estimate his value for our day, we must see clearly the environment in which he grew up, for it will serve to clarify much of the confusion which exists relative to the life of our Lord. In considering the sources we must remember that many of them are colored for propaganda purposes, particularly Josephus, and that because of the fragmentary nature of much of it, such deductions have been made which as time goes on, further New Testament study may completely alter. The Synoptic problem must be recognized and an attempt made to use only those passages that are considered authentic by a majority of modern scholars. In considering the work of our modern authorities one must allow for the subjective elements involved in their findings. With the basic assumptions clearly in mind and the above cautionary statements, it now becomes our problem to know and understand the economic, political, social, moral and religious environment in which Jesus grew up and from that study to go on to some conclusions as to the value of his life and teachings for the problems of the present day.

Chapter IIIThe Geography of Palestine

For a country so small, Palestine has contributed much to the world. Geographically it is about 150 miles long from North to South and averages about 40 miles in width, west of the Jordan River. There is less than 6000 square miles included in its limits. The entire land is without summer rains and depends for its moisture upon the percipitation which comes in the winter months which is the rainy season. Due to the hilly nature of the country there is little opportunity for irrigation. The only outlet to the sea is at the northern end of the country. For the most part the principle occupations of Jesus' day were agriculture, herding and sheep raising. "Except to the desert nomad or the purblind fanatic it can hardly be a beautiful country. There are strange and picturesque scenes innumerable; there are prospects of magnificent desolation. There are a few quiet landscapes where the eye delights to dwell and the soul is invited to rest and repose. In Palestine proper there are no magnificent rivers, no wide-sweeping plains, but everywhere stony heaths and desolate moors, rough rocks and rugged gorges, interspersed with occasional orchards, meadows, and fields. Forests are now entirely wanting in western Palestine. During the greater part of the year the country is a drab combination of gray and brown. Only in late winter and early spring is there an outburst of flowers and green foliage that charms the Easter tourist into ecstasies."³

Upper Galilee is higher and more mountainous, some of the peaks rising to an altitude of 6000 feet. The western mountains fall from Mt. Lebanon at 6000 feet to Upper and then Lower Galilee. The Plain of Esdraelon and the Valley of Jezreel separate this range from that in Samaria and Judea where the mountains rise again to more than 3000 feet. Lower Galilee is sprinkled with low hills and fine valleys in which the scyamores grow. Galilee measures 50 to 60 miles north and south and 25-35 miles east and west and has an area of about 1600 square miles. It is by far the most fertile section of Western Palestine.

The climate of Palestine has been a very important factor in the social, moral and religious development of Israel. "Climate affects the individual and the group directly because it conditions physical and mental vigor and spiritual outlook."⁴ Palestine lying as it does in a sub-tropical zone enjoys a climate similar to that of Southern California. There are two seasons, a cool and rainy winter, a hot and dry summer. It lies on the border line between the sea on the west and the Syrian desert on the east; between the watered regions in the mountains of Lebanon in the north and the desert belt of the Sahara in the south. The winds blow at times from the desert, but more often from the sea. The east or southeast wind brings sluggishness and inactivity in the summer and produces vigor and activity in the winter months. The west winds are the saving factor in the climate of Palestine but the desert is never far away.

The remarkable variation of altitude within the

land contributes to a variety of climate. The Jordan Valley descends to 1300 feet below sea level at the Dead Sea and much of this region is tropical in its climate. But it is only about one hundred miles to Mt. Hermon where there is snow the year round. "Thus the meteorological phenomena and the plants and animals of all the zones from the tropics to the Arctic Circle are found within the compass of a little more than one hundred miles, a fact which materially contributed to making the literature which arose in this insignificant country intelligible to all the nations of the world."⁵

There is little land to cultivate. The present government survey indicates that about 47 percent of the whole is productive under normal climatic conditions. The uncertainty of the rains and the unusually dry periods which follow oftentimes in successive years contribute much to the uncertainty of production. When the large sections of pasture and waste land are deducted from the total acreage of Palestine there remains only a few hundred thousands of acres that can be cultivated and then only by dry farming methods, for the rainfall is so uncertain and limited. By a variation of crops and careful and skillful farming methods and normal climatic conditions, the Jewish farmer can produce some products upon his land.

Of necessity then, Palestine is now and has always been predominantly a pastoral country. Although the rainfall is scarce, the constitution of its soil makes it fit for cattle raising and sheep breeding. Even the farmer, during the summer months, leaves his farm and follows

the flocks over the hills only to return and harvest his crops during the farming season. Thus the agriculturalist leads a semi-nomadic life. It is seen then, that agriculture and animal husbandry are the only significant internal sources of wealth in Palestine.

BOOK II Political Background of Jesus' life.Chapter IVPalestine as a Political Battleground.

The country around the Mediterranean, of which Palestine is an important part was a constant battleground for some 800 years before Christ. "Just as the merchandise of the surrounding nations met in peaceful competition in the markets of Palestine, so the armies of these nations also met there in battle. The situation of Palestine, between its powerful neighbors on the Nile and on the Euphrates, made it a battleground where these great nations fought for many centuries. Over and over again, unhappy Palestine went through the experience of little Belgium in the World War. Egypt held Palestine for many centuries (early 16th. to 12th.) Later Assyria conquered the Northern Kingdom (722-606) Chaldea held it from 604 to 561 B.C. and it finally fell into the hands of Persia, where it remained until 330 B.C. When therefore the Hebrews took possession of the land, there was little prospect that they would ever long enjoy freedom from foreign oppression."⁶

Alexander the Great put an end to the Persian empire about 330 B.C. and this brought Israel into touch with the Grecian world. It also brought to an end the easy and peaceful allegiance which Judea had enjoyed for about two centuries. But it did more than this, with the establishment of such a vast Hellenic empire, under the leadership of Alexander, a new element was introduced into the old world of Asia. The old civilization gave way to the new.

After Alexander's death, Palestine passed into the hands of Egypt, whose rulers were favourable to the Jews, at least in their own land, although the Palestinian Jews did from time to time feel the hand of foreign domination. A struggle between Egypt and Syria which lasted until the reign of Seleucus IV, must have caused Palestine to suffer severely. Josephus says of this period (Ant. xii 3.3) whichever party gained, Palestine was "like a ship in a storm which is tossed by the waves on both sides." Otherwise it was a time of comparative independence for the country. The secular and spiritual power was vested in the hereditary high-priests. The country paid a general tribute which was not in itself exorbitant.

The office of the high-priest appears to have been administered well and justly until the time of the death of Simon the Just, at the beginning of the third century B. C. His successors attempted to strengthen their positions by political maneuverings and favoritism. There were three parties in constant conflict in Palestine, those favoring the Egyptians, those who sided with the Syrian cause, and the "house of Tobias" the high-priestly group who claimed to be descendents of King David. By the time the Egyptian party within the country gave way to Syrian domination under Seleucus IV, the Syrian protagonists and especially the Tobias party had become Hellenized. "In truth, the contest now became one for power and wealth, in which each sought to outbid the other by bribery and subserviency to the foreigner. As the submission of the people could only be secured by the virtual extermination

of Judaism, this aim was steadily kept in view by the degenerate priesthood."⁷

The successor of Seleucus IV, Antiochus IV, Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.) ruthlessly set out to exterminate Judaism and substitute for it, Hellenism. This led to the Maccabean uprising. Antiochus was encouraged and abetted in this endeavor by the Grecianized and degenerate high-priesthood. The Jews flocked to the leadership of the Maccabees, or Asmoneans, as they are called in Jewish history. Under the generalship of Judas, the son of Mattathias the first of the family, the Jews were successful in gaining liberty of conscience and worship, although the people acknowledged the supremacy of Syria.

Conditions did not however, remain harmonious within the nationalist group, especially so, when Judas made overtures toward an alliance with the Roman power which was beginning to overshadow the East. At his death Jonothan his younger brother became the leader of the Maccabean party. Conditions were very unsatisfactory during his leadership and he was assassinated because of his political intrigue.

The government of Judea could not have fallen into better hands at this time than it did, in the person of Simon Maccabeus. He was successful in gaining for his people the remission of all taxes in return for his support of Demetrius the Syrian claimant for the throne. Secondly, he was able to rid the country of the foreigner. Lastly, he was fairly successful in subjugating the

Grecian party in Judea which brought peace and security to his own people. This was the Golden Age of the Maccabean party and it reached its climax with the arrival of a Roman embassy in Judea to renew the league which had already been made by Judas and Jonothan. Simon replied to this recognition by sending a Jewish delegation to Rome, which brought back with it a valuable shield of gold in token of gratitude. In their thankfulness the Jews passed a decree making Simon their high-priest and governor forever. In other words he became both the secular and spiritual chief.

The Chasidim or Pharisaic Party were hostile to the occupancy of the priesthood by the Maccabean house but their opposition was repressed by the critical state of affairs within the nation. After the death of Simon Maccabeus, the high-priestly office went to John Hyrcanus his son. (135-105 B.C.) He sought and secured peace from the Syrians and upon their withdrawal he subjected Samaria and Idumea to the kingdom of Judea. The treaty with Rome was again renewed and soon Hyrcanus was able to throw off all allegiance to the foreigner, because of the rapid decline of the Syrian monarchy.

At his death he left five sons, the most important of whom was Alexander Jannaeus. (104-78 B.C.) His reign falls into three periods: the first, lasted eight or ten years in which the cities of the coast were added to his possessions. The second period is marked by a struggle between the high-priest and the Pharisees, who now had become sticklers for legalism. It was a period

of internal dissension. The third period is one of military success and of reconciliation with the Pharisees. Alexander Jannaeus died in his fiftieth year bequeathing the government to his wife, Salome. The chief event of importance in his reign, is the coming into power of the Pharisees. For the first time the term Sanhedrin comes into use. It came to be the ecclesiastical authority and endeavored more or less successfully to arrogate to itself civil jurisdictions as well.

Dissension and disagreement followed, much of it being fomented by Antipater, the father of Herod Antipas, one of the arch-plotters of all time. Also the power of the Roman government had increased and Jerusalem fell into the hands of Pompey in 63 B.C. This brought to an end the Maccabean reign and the independence of Palestine. The Maccabees had accomplished much for Israel. They "raised the small province into an independent kingdom and out of Judea fashioned the Jewish Palestine. The Maccabees who did the most were Judas, John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus. Under the latter Judea enlarged until it took in as much territory as was Israel's in the time of David and Solomon.....But for the heroism of the Maccabees, the heathen must finally have swallowed up the Jews. Only by their conquests and forced conversions could Judaism be established in its ancestral home and become a power, strong politically and socially, so that even the Romans, great conquerors though they were, were forced to take them seriously; otherwise the Jews must have remained a negligible quantity both in religion and civilization.

Such, then, constitutes what the great Maccabean conquerors accomplished for Judaism and, therefore, for the whole of humanity as well."⁸

Under Pompey, the Roman dealt gently with Judea. Those who had caused the siege of Jerusalem were executed and the country made a tributary of Rome. Judea's boundaries were narrowed by the restoration of the independence of the Grecian cities and by the freeing of Samaria from Jewish supremacy. Soon the renewed attempts of the house of Maccabee, under Aristobulus to regain their power led to fresh troubles. Antipater was still on the scene as the advisor of Hyrcanus II and as a result of his intercession for the cause of Julius Caesar he was appointed Roman administrator for the country. He appointed his son Herod governor of Galilee. When Julius Caesar was assassinated and Cassius came to the throne, Antipater and Herod were as willing to serve him. Trouble arose between Antigonus, a Maccabean, and the family of Antipater. Hyrcanus II and Phasaël another son of Antipater were lured into the hands of Antigonus, the former was made unfit for the priesthood and the latter slain. Herod, having been warned, escaped. Antigonus was now undisputed high-priest and king. His reign lasted three years. (40-37 B.C.) Herod sought the help of Rome and Antigonus was overthrown, and Herod was made King of Judea. (40 B.C.) He was not successful in regaining his power however, until three years later.

During the period of sanguinary wars and the tyranny of Herod, as well as the power assumed by the Romans upon Herod's death, the best powers of the Jewish nation

were laid low. These things weakened it as a state and were the instruments for stirring up much of the political Messianism which grew up in this period. The conception of a Messiahship that was other-worldly, developed during these years and it played a part in the mental confusion which effected the thinking of the Jews so greatly.

Upon Herod's death, Archelaus, his son came into power. Tumults and riots immediately broke out, occasioned by the hatred of the Jews for the house of Herod. All Judea was out of control, the country was over-run by rebel leaders. The revolt spread throughout all the provinces of Judea and even beyond the Jordan. The words of the gospel writer were indeed true, "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes." All of this occurred only three or four years before the birth of Jesus. After much difficulty the Romans succeeded in crushing the rebellion. Whereupon, Augustus Caesar ceded to Archelaus, Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, but was not given the title of 'king.' He was given the title of 'Ethnarch' (leader of the people) He ruled in this capacity from 4 B.C. to 6 A.D. but because of his ruthlessness he was exiled to Gaul by the Emperor. Judea, Samaria and Idumea were attached to Syria and put in charge of a procurator. This section of Palestine was important to Rome and the procurator or governor was placed over it as the Emperor felt that the high-priest was not enough.

No important step was taken without the consent of

the procurator. He resided in Caesaria and came to Jerusalem at the time of the feasts. There was a standing army in Palestine responsible to him and were the agency for the maintenance of order and peace. Jewish judges might still decide in cases relating to property and the Sanhedrin could only pass a sentence of death, not put it into action. All sentences involving capital punishment must be confirmed by the governor. He exercised the right to depose and appoint the high-priest and the ecclesiastical robes were in his keeping. This was a definite insult to the Jews. "A people like the Jews, believing in the power of the spirit, could not but see in such a government, exercised by the 'godless kingdom' and dependent upon force, the harsh visitation of God which was to precede the imminent redemption. In the mind of the Jew the Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of Edom were two opposing conceptions, each of which called up the picture of the other."⁹

The two procurators with which we are primarily concerned are Valerius Gratus (15-26 A.D.) and Pontius Pilate. The former was infamous for his frequent changing of the high-priestly office. These positions were secured by bribes which probably accounts for the shortness of the terms. Pilate became procurator in 26 A.D. and remained in this office until 36 A.D. The Judea of his day was marked by bribery, vain-glorious and insolent conduct, robbery, oppression, humiliation, and men were all too often sent to death without trial and were the victims of severe cruelty. He flouted the image of the Emperor be-

fore the Jews which Tiberius eventually ordered stopped. He used the temple revenue to build huge aqueducts. He set spies among the people and those who were detected were beaten to death. The history of Judea during this period was one of intense unrest and dissatisfaction on the part of the Jews.

Summary of conditions under Rome.

From the outbreak of the war between Aristobulus and John Hyrcanus to the procuratorship of Pilate in Judea and Herod Antipas in Galilee, scarcely a year went by without wars or other disturbances. Over 200,000 men fell in the uprisings or were murdered by Herod and the procurators. This is an enormous number in so small a country. Those who died in the wars were the pick of the men physically and those murdered were the best intellectually and culturally. Most of the survivors were weak and vapid or among those lost in dreams of other-worldliness. These latter took no part in events of state but occupied themselves purely with religious matters or speculative abstractions. The procurators and Herod the Great by cruelty and extermination had sapped the courage of the Jews. "At this time therefore, near to the time when Jesus was born, none dared take part in political affairs or adopt a definite attitude towards the fortunes of his miserable but beloved fatherland: he might not even utter his ideas aloud. Spies were everywhere and police held the population in subjection; all alike were downtrodden and overcome with fear."¹⁰

Some of the Jews joined the Zealots and put themselves in open opposition by word and sword. Others fell to studying the Torah and comforted themselves by teaching the knowledge of God and a higher and ethical standard of living. The more weak and downtrodden and passive among the people cultivated mystic and secret doctrines which were distinctly other-worldly. From such soil as this sprang up the various and sundry sects which were in existence in Jesus' day.

The Sadducees were practical politicians and had come to terms with the Roman government for two reasons: they saw that opposition was hopeless and they were themselves rich and dreaded any change which might interfere with their wealth. But the rest of the people could not come to such terms with the conquerors and they groaned under the yoke of the Romans. The Romans could not understand the Jews, no more could the Jews understand the Romans. Klausner very aptly expresses it thus: "the Jews no more understood the Romans than did the Romans understand the spirit of those Jews who showed themselves capable of rising in solid revolt over what, to the Romans seemed matters of the most trivial importance. Images of the Emperor, for example, were not religious but only political emblems, yet the Jews deafened the whole world with their protests against them. The Olympian games and wrestling contests again, had nothing to do with religion and were good themselves, yet the Jews raved against these also. And what had theatres and circuses to do with religion?

Yet the Jews would bar them in Judea. And in the case of so useful a matter as aqueducts, why could not the Temple 'Qorban' funds be used to provide them? Yet the Jews nearly raised a rebellion over it. It could be nothing but sheer obstinacy and an innate rebellious nature. Such was the conclusion of the Roman officials.....nor could they have any clear conception of the singular characteristics of Jewish faith. So they behaved themselves deviously with the perverse: in every popular outburst of protest, unpolitical in character, the Roman officials saw a preliminary to revolt and therefore crushed the outburst without mercy. This but served the more to enrage the people, who well knew how far they were from revolt, and to strengthen their complaints anew and so lead on to a further measure of suppression by the Roman executioner who only saw a second attempt at rebellion, and so the misunderstanding continued."¹¹

The Sanhedrin.

Before concluding this chapter something must be said relative to the Sanhedrin and its powers. The major cities had their own Sanhedrins but the one at the capitol city of Jerusalem was the supreme court of appeal. In the time of rebellion it organized all of Judea. It was the supreme institution of legalistic Judaism. As it became predominantly Pharisaic it gained in prestige and influence. Under Herod it was the creature of the King, but under an established provincial government it became the supreme court for all cases of importance under the Mosaic

Law. It had no direct authority in Galilee although its pronouncements were honored. In Judea it could arrest, try and condemn to any punishment except death.

The Sanhedrin at Jerusalem was made up of 72 members all pure Jews. Twenty-three of this number constituted a quorum. Members were inducted into its membership by the laying on of hands. Its members were not all of equal rank, but the high-priestly group was the most important. The others were scribes and elders. A Committee of Ten headed by the high-priest was the executive group of the Sanhedrin.

The Sanhedrin thus in the course of time gathered unto itself many powers and came to be the supreme agency of local government for the Jew. Its pronouncements were in the main final and authoritative, and Rome due to its provincial policy honored its decisions and supported its policies. In general, the establishment of the Roman administration probably affected Jewish society but little. It may even have been acceptable to the Pharisees if, as Josephus says, (Ant. 20.10) "the government fell really into the hands of the native aristocracy with the high-priest at its head." "The Jews were required to take the oath of allegiance to each new emperor.... but this requirement was more than offset by the religious liberty given the Jews, the guaranteed sanctity of the temple, and the general leniency shown their intense religious feeling. Apart from the Zealots, it is probable that there was but a minority of the inhabitants of Judea that did not assent heartily to the daily sacrifices of two

lambs and an ox for the welfare of the emperor...Indeed from the days of Julius Caesar, the Jews had enjoyed special favours from the Romans, who, it will be remembered, seldom interfered with a conquered people's customs and institutions further than was absolutely necessary, in the interest of good administration."¹²

The trouble that came upon the Jews was a result of the sporadic uprisings of the Zealots and other revolutionaries. The people as a whole were not disturbed by the Roman administration nearly so much as it would seem on the surface. Judaism was itself a paradox for from the time of Alexander, the idea of world unity had developed and become embodied in the empire. National laws and ethnic religions were abolished or made to contribute to this unity. This was due to two things: military conquest and the penetration of Hellenism into the life of the world of that day. The nations that bordered the Mediterranean were unified in this one way at least, by a super-imposed political control and an inner cultural attitude. Judaism while within this process of unification, nevertheless, withstood it. The Jews that were scattered throughout the cities of the successive empires lacked independent nationality most of the time, but they maintained an independent ethnic and religious spirit. They shared the economic and literary spirit of the Graeco-Roman world, but its organized religion refused to compromise. In the midst of polytheism they worshiped one God, in a world of easy morals they clung to a mode of life which made every detail of conduct, divine direction. While submitting to

the process of political unification they developed their own hope of imperial unity which was the gift of God.

The reasons for this exclusiveness was their intense racial loyalty and the fundamental religious and ethnic independence of the Jews. The geographical situation in which they lived helped to segregate them from a system which was essentially pagan. But the one underlying principle which maintained their independent attitude towards the unifying process of the Roman government was their abiding sense of God's eternal promise to them as a race set apart.

Chapter VEconomic and Social Conditions in PalestineTrades and Occupations of the Jewish People

From ancient times the Jewish people have been for the most part a nomadic race, depending for their subsistence upon sheep raising and generally unsettled living. In the time of Jesus, outside of the cities, the main occupation was agriculture. The farmers, however, lived in the villages not on the farms. Most of the chief forms of agriculture known to the Jews consisted of the products that came from the vineyards, olive groves, grain fields and fruit orchards. Enough grain was grown in normal seasons to allow for some export. Sowing began after the early rains had fallen at the end of October or the first weeks of November. The harvest began about the middle of April and was completed in approximately seven weeks. Thus we have, according to Shailer Matthews, "The origin of the great feasts; passover, at the beginning of the barley harvest, pentecost, at the end of the grain harvest, the tabernacles, after all crops are gathered in."¹³ Terracing and irrigation were necessary as well as rotation of crops in order to make up for the lack of rainfall. One contributing factor which made for the enrichment of the soil was the disintegration of the limestone rocks. The dairy trade was considerably developed and poultry, doves and geese were raised.

In New Testament times the great bulk of commerce and trade was in the hands of the Greeks but due to the policy of the Maccabean regime a commercial class arose among the Jews. They exported such agricultural products as olive oil, balsam, figs, bitumin and salt from the Dead Sea, as well as fish from the Sea of Galilee, these were pickled and preserved at an establishment at Tarichaea. In fact, commerce at Tiberius had become sufficiently extensive to establish a market with an inspector.

During the time of the first temple and the beginning of the second, in the Persian period, the merchants were in the main Canaanites and from them the Jews learned the business of the merchant and the peddler. During the time of Alexander the Great when Jerusalem was surrounded by Greek cities, which were mainly trade centers, the Jews also learned the art of commerce from the Greeks. This is apparent from the many Greek mercantile terms: 'Siton' the general dealer in corn produce; the 'monopol' or dealer in one variety of corn or other goods; and the 'p'latar' a dealer in various articles, especially in bread. By Jesus' day internal trade was well developed. The regular pilgrimages to Jerusalem at the time of great festivals, served to stimulate this internal trade. The Palestinian towns exchanged their agricultural produce. Sharon in Judea sold its wines and bought bread; Jericho and the Jordan Valley sold their famous fruits for bread and wine. Palestine also exported its surplus oil, wine, wheat and fruit, while

it imported a large number of commodities. Trade routes within the country were numerous, and many important routes radiated towards neighboring states.

Export and import dues were levied on merchandise which were paid to tax-gatherers and publicans. Taxes were often exorbitant and because of the graft the name publican came to be synonymous with robber, brigand, ruffian, murderer and reprobate. The Romans exacted from the Palestinians a water-tax, a city-tax, a tax on such necessities of life as meat and salt, a road tax and a house tax. The frontier tax proved a special hardship as it resulted in the sale of goods in the Roman market at a hundred times higher cost than at the place of their origin and manufacture. Such taxes impoverished the people and enraged them.

There were bankers and money-lenders who functioned at the seat of exchange. They often charged exorbitant interest and their demands were often and almost entirely out of sympathy with the welfare of their debtors. Notwithstanding the many heavy taxes and customs dues, home and foreign trade enriched a portion of the Jews. Jewish ships manned by Jewish crews and laden with Jewish merchandise, sailed the Mediterranean, the Black Sea, the Nile and the Euphrates and traveled as far as France, Spain, Cyrene, Carthage and even India.

Manual trades were regarded as honorable pursuits by the Jews. It was the duty of parents to see that their sons were trained in some skill and the Rabbis themselves had some occupation of this nature. All of the occupations,

however, were not of the same value and it was the ambition of every father to have his son adopt one of the more important ones. That the Jewish society was highly developed industrially is seen by the great variety of trades mentioned in Jewish literature. Some of them had been developed into embryonic unions. The Jews were alert and practiced in handicrafts. There were no less than forty kinds of craftsman in Jesus day, ranging from the lowest type of craft to the highest. These crafts were passed on from father to son. Indeed whole cities were famous for one class of work. The Jews had factories giving employment to whole families and also smaller workshops with an owner and several apprentices.

As we have seen the Jews were essentially an agricultural people, especially was this true in Galilee which was particularly famous for its wheat. In a normal season the farmer reaped five-fold from normal soil, while with extremely good seasons and from fruitful soil he reaped as much as a hundred-fold. The country was also rich in vegetables.

The Jews in Jesus day were also shepherds and cattlemen. Jerusalem had a special cattle market in which the animals were sold. Also to these markets came the poultry raisers to dispose of their produce.

Another class among the Jews were those trained in the professions. There were Jewish lawyers practicing in both Jewish and Roman courts, also a few physicians

although there was the common Jewish prejudice and fear of defilement from a dead body. Bleeding was practiced but it was done by the barber. The use of medicine was accompanied by and conditioned by the Jewish belief in evil spirits.

Economic Divisions Among the People

Ideally there were no such things as class distinctions in Jesus' day, anymore than there are in America today, but practically the opposite was true. The majority of the people were peasants possessing small holdings. Writings of the day have little to say regarding the artisan, but much of the peasantry. The reason is probably seen in the fact that the Jewish artisan had a hard time to compete against the foreign goods that flooded the country. Such things as stools, handkerchiefs, sandals and felt hats were imported from abroad. The part played by the artisan was quite unimportant but it was otherwise with the peasant or small 'land-holder,' those whose land furnished them with the bulk of their daily existence. They formed the major part of the population of Jesus' day, living almost entirely by the labor of their own hands. They, their wives and children did the cultivating and most of the produce was reserved for their own use, the remainder being taken to market and exchanged or sold, the income of which went to buy other necessities of life. This 'small holder' was unable to lay by any wealth. Bad crop years or illness served to deprive him of his property as it became necessary

to borrow from a wealthier class of peasant. Thus he was reduced to the status of a hireling or slave because of his debts. "In any case some of his children would be forced to become hirelings since the small-holding sufficed only for the eldest son who received 'a double share' of their inheritance. The other sons not having land enough for their needs, were in spite of themselves turned into members of the 'proletariat,' the class which owns nothing but its powers of work. When no work was forthcoming they were reduced to the level of 'unemployed laborers,' and became beggars or robbers and brigands." 14

There was also a class of wealthier peasants, although few in number, who lent money or seed to the poorer land-holders on security of the latter's property. Palestine thus had both an artisan and a hireling class. The latter usually hired himself out for a definite period, not to exceed six years. He could also hire out his services by the day. This group were not always 'small holders' or sons of peasants, but were sometimes the group known as "l'qutoth", peasants who owned no land but worked as hired laborers for rich landholders and others. The "Po'el" or artisan among this group hired out only for some definite craft. The Talmud mentions the "unemployed Po'el" and the gospels also contain a story about a certain householder who desiring to hire workmen found some who 'had been idle all day' because 'no man had hired them.' An agreement by word of mouth was usually enough between the householder

and the workman and if either of the two parties should break the agreement a fine had to be paid. All in all this laborer received a pretty square deal and conditions were in the main bearable. Their position was much better than that of the Egyptian or Babylonian laborer, by reason of the simpler living conditions and scarcity of men of great wealth. Also the democratic spirit which had become infused into the thinking of the people due to the teachings of the Scribes and later the Pharisees, did much to make for just working conditions. Most of this laboring class worked on the land although some worked for craftsmen as apprentices. They worked ten hours a day and received an average wage of eight pence per day.

There were various divisions within the peasant class; the contractor or middle-man who sought to carry out the work and pay all taxes and in return received a half or a quarter of the produce, and the tenant farmer who tilled and harvested the land owned by another and received for his wages a third or a quarter of the produce. This class was not so common in Palestine, but were important enough to be cited in the New Testament in the Parable of the "Wicked Husbandman." (Mt. 21:33-42) This parable also reveals the fact of strife between the tenant-farmer and the propertied class. There was the Lessee who gave a fixed portion of the produce in lieu of rent. If the land produced abundantly, he gained, if not he was the loser. There was the hirer who was in a sense identical with the

lessee except that he paid his rent in money rather than in produce. Lastly, there were male and female household servants. "Thus, apart from the comparatively few large land owners with great estates and the more numerous well-to-do class of peasant, we find a multitude of small-holders and a complete 'proletariat' of every kind: hirelings, artisans, landless peasants, tenants, lessees, renters (and, to a certain extent, contractors,) household servants and personal attendants. These were all men and women who had no means of subsistence beyond their ability to work. So long as they could secure work, all was well with them; but if not, they were reduced to want and beggary -- the passive victims of grievances and the dreamers of dreams, or else imbued with violent rage and the spirit of revolt."¹⁵

The household servants were not in any sense slaves as they could hire out to anyone they desired. There were however slaves in Palestine, who lived under comparatively just conditions, if a state of slavery can be called just in any sense. They did not lack for work or food but were in a true sense slaves. They could not choose their work or their master. "It might be true from the humanitarian standpoint of the Talmud that the body of the Hebrew slave is not a 'thing that can be bought' and that 'whoso getteth a Hebrew slave is as he that getteth himself a master; but such humanitarian laws were, so far as the time of Jesus was concerned, merely academic expressions of opinion. The Hebrew slave in his master's house was then an actual slave,

enslaved in body and mind to his master and feeding from the crumbs off his master's table; he was, however, spared the consciousness of perpetual slavery and so his spirit was not wholly crushed. The primitive relationship prevailing between master and slave in a country where the simple life was the rule and the democratic Pharisaic spirit was much in evidence, largely removed the possibility of cruelty and persecution; none the less, a master could scourge an idle or disobedient slave and treat him altogether as an inferior being."¹⁶

There were some Canaanitish slaves in Palestine but they were not a numerous or an important group. These were tailors, barbers, bakers, butchers, and even tutors and teachers. This group were bound by written contracts and sold as though they were goods or cattle. A mark was put upon them so that in case of their escape they could easily be identified. A seal was stamped on them or a bell hung upon them or they wore a special cap, and sometimes even their flesh was branded like cattle. Legally they were chattel and could have no property of their own. The work of their hands, their finds, and even the money acquired through compensation for injury belonged to their master. "Canaanitish slavery was then a horrible plague affecting the national body of Israel as was also the case with other nations in those days. Even if the Canaanitish slaves took no part in the subversive political and religious movements in Palestine, by their very existence they

unwittingly helped to bring them about. Harsh slavery invariably produces a body of malcontents and there is no more readily available fuel for such movements than those men who have been crushed and reduced to the level of brute beasts."¹⁷

Educational and Intellectual Life of Palestine.

The education of the Jew was essentially religious. Men were first servants of Jehovah and second citizens. It is doubtful if there were public schools in Jesus' day, the children being trained in the Synagogues and at home. But by 65 A.D. schools for boys in every town were a necessity. These might be in the synagogue, if the town was poor. The instruction that was given was "viva voce." Learning was entirely from the Scriptures till the boy was ten years of age. The main emphasis was upon reading and writing as it was the supreme desire of the Jewish parent to instruct his son in the Law. Josephus emphatically says, (Con. Apion 2:25) "Most of us are mindful of the education of children; so that if anyone ask us concerning the laws, we can tell them all more easily than our own name. Having learnt them straightway with our earliest perception they become engraven in our souls."

From ten to fifteen years of age the boy was taught the Mishna and probably some rudiments of science. After that his schooling was over unless he wanted to go into a profession. The Torah was expounded to the common people on the Sabbath and on market-days so that the

villagers who came to town acquired some notion of the Law. In spite of this most of the village folk were "Amme ha-aretz". (ignorant of the Torah).

There was little of artistic knowledge among the Jews because of the inherent prejudice against making graven images. Music, however, was brought to considerable perfection and was commonly used in the temple services.

It is a mistake to suppose that the learning of the educated Jew was confined to the Torah and the Mishna. There was secular learning in Israel as well. The poetical and narrative literatures which have been preserved as apocrypha and pseudipigrapha possess a wonderful beauty and variety, most of which came from the period just preceding and just following the life of Jesus. Contemporary Jewish art, especially architecture, the mausoleums and ceramic ware, have a notable beauty and grandeur and a national peculiarity. From the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees and at a later time in the Mishna, it is apparent that the Jews possessed much knowledge relative to the calendar, of astronomy in general, of geography, general and Hebrew history, physiology human and animal, geometry and land surveying. "Such studies could not, of course, be compared in importance with the religious study of the Torah. But the Jewish religion has a wide scope: it comprises all the wisdom of life, all the knowledge that satisfies the needs of an entire nation; it does not isolate religion from learning and life. In essence it is not so much a religion

as a national world outlook based on religion. It includes philosophy, jurisprudence, science, and rules of seemly behaviour such as are usually classed under religion."¹⁸

Social Life in Palestine.

It is difficult to estimate the population in the Palestine of Jesus' day. The figures of Josephus seem exaggerated. Shailer Mathews says that it is difficult to see how there could have been more than three million people in the 6000 square miles of land west of the Jordan. This does not seem to be an estimate that is too conservative when the geographical facts are taken into consideration. Much of the land was mountainous and not conducive to settled existence. The bulk of the people must have lived in the cities and towns. Jerusalem could hardly have had a population of more than 100,000 within its walls.

The Jewish population used at least three languages, Aramaic, Greek and Latin. The use of the first two must have been widespread, particularly is this true of Aramaic. Latin however, was the official language. Also Biblical Hebrew was in use in the religious services of the temples and synagogues, but was not universally understood.

The structure of the towns present a marked contrast. In Ceasarea, Tiberias and Jerusalem, the noble buildings erected by the Greeks, towered above the flat

houses of the masses. The small towns, on the other hand, probably did not differ much from the small towns in Palestine today. The houses were simple with flat roofs, the walls being built of mud, with straw packed in and around the wattlework and baked in the sun. The streets were narrow and sanitary conditions were not always of the best. The water supply for the town was usually that of some nearby spring, reservoir or aqueduct. With the exception of the synagogue, there were no public buildings. Such architectural remains as are found in Palestine are chiefly those of the Greek settlers, as the strictly Jewish town of Jesus day, is no more, and very little trace of their existence can be found.

Life in the Jewish towns of Jesus' day was Semitic rather than Greek, at least in so far as the Jewish inhabitants were concerned. There was practically no social classification except that of slaves and free-men. There was, however, particularly in the larger cities a marked distinction between the wealthy and the poor. The wealthy were usually those sympathetic toward the Herodians and Sadducees, and were in the main rich merchants and land-lords. The masses were on the verge of want most of the time. As we have mentioned before slavery existed, but it was as merciful as slavery could possibly be. The owner could not kill his slave and must not deter him from observing the Sabbath. The Jewish slaves were treated with comparative leniency but the foreign slaves were not so fortunate. The Pharisees and the Essenes

were opposed to slavery and already there had arisen a strong sentiment against it. In truth it was considerably on the decrease in New Testament times.

As to the position of women it must in fairness be said that the Jewish women were treated with more respect than was the case in other parts of the Roman Empire. They were not as carefully educated and were considered to be of an inferior sex. The writings and the teachings of the Rabbis abound in praises of good wives and of marriage in general. The sphere of women, however, was distinctly domestic. The ideal Jewess was the good housekeeper and if she could not afford servants her duties as stated in the Mishna were the grinding of corn, baking, washing, cooking, nursing of the children, making of beds and the working of wool. Property might be settled upon the wife by her husband by a legal arrangement.

As to religion the position of women was also inferior to that of the men. They were not permitted to go beyond the Women's Court in the Temple, and could not wear phylacteries, and were not obliged to recite the Shema or wear fringes upon their mantles. They were seated in a different section from the men in the synagogues, usually in a gallery behind a trellis. Although not counted as members of the congregation, they nevertheless, were required to kindle the Sabbath light and to observe all holy days, and were like the men, subject to the positive commandments of the Torah.

Their family life was definitely monogamous, although Shailer Mathews says that it may have been polygamous among some of the richer classes. But the ease of divorce would seem to make polygamy unnecessary. Marriage to the Jew was distinctly a private affair. It existed in the exchange of certain promises and the public and somewhat formal passage of the bride from her father's house to the home of her future husband. In theory, at least, the wife was the property of her husband. This is evident, not only in the wedding ceremony but also in the fact that father's sometimes sold young daughters to men on the condition that they should subsequently be made their wives.

The betrothal might be made by a third party and oftentimes when children were small. The young woman was given a piece of money and a document containing the various promises which her husband made to her. A public declaration was made by the man that he had betrothed the woman. After the betrothal the two could live together and the wedding soon followed. This ceremony was similar to the betrothal and was without religious sanctification unless the rabbi was present to give a benediction. The woman was expected to bring a dowry to her husband. The celebration and the ceremony lasted for several days.

Divorce was rapidly increasing during New Testament times. Unfortunately, it like marriage was a private affair and not concerned with the law. It seems to have

degenerated by the end of the first Christian century until husbands could divorce their wives on almost any pretext. The right to divorce was usually the husbands but later on the rabbis granted this right to the women. At the same time the practice of divorce was doubtless curtailed by the requirement that the husband return the dowry in case of such action being taken.

Means for Social Expression.

There were various opportunities in Palestine for social intercourse. In connection with weddings, births and private feasts there was much revelry and good times. The village well, the gate and the market-place were gathering centers for fellowship and intercourse. In the Greek cities the gymnasium, theatre, and arena afforded amusement for those who would attend them. At harvest time and at the vintage festivals and at all other religious and semi-religious celebrations the people came together for a dual purpose, to commemorate and thank their God for a bountiful harvest and to celebrate together and enjoy the goodness of life. Many of the towns of Palestine were on the main caravan routes and were of necessity hosts to many travelers. In Jesus' day and in ours the traveler in Palestine is received hospitably and given the best the family affords. In short, the social life in the towns of Palestine resembled in some measure the life of the small town today.

Summary

The Jew of Jesus' day was an agriculturalist, or a commercialist and some few of them were professional men. Manual trades were regarded as honorable pursuits and every father sought to teach his boys some trade. Others of the Jews were herdsmen and dairymen, some of whom combined this occupation with farming in the harvest season. In good seasons the Jews raised enough produce to export some of it. On the journeys to Jerusalem and the cities enroute there was much trading and selling of produce for other necessities of Jewish life.

Ideally there were no class distinctions in Palestine but in reality this was not the case. The majority of the people were peasants and were often times on the verge of poverty and their "small holdings" became mortgaged to the richest peasants. There was a group of workers who labored by the day or for stated times. This group of hirelings were not slaves for they could hire out to anyone they wished. There were, however, slaves both Jewish and Canaanitish, the former received comparatively good treatment, while the latter were bought and sold as cattle and all that they possessed was the property of their masters.

The education of the Jew was essentially religious. The synagogues were the first primary schools, although soon after Jesus' time boys schools were organized in many of the towns of Palestine. The Law and the

Scriptures were the foundations of their education. There were also some higher schools for those who desired to enter professions, but the masses availed themselves only of the synagogue schools. There was, however, some secular training for the Jewish boy and he was naturally thrown into contact with the culture of the lands about him.

The population of Palestine, approximately three millions of people, spoke in the main Aramaic and Greek, although the more learned groups spoke and used Latin as well. The houses within the small towns were simple and presented a contrast to the more pretentious building within the city. The synagogue was in most cases the largest building within the towns and was the center of the educational and social life.

Women were treated with more respect in Palestine than in other parts of the Roman Empire but they were to all intents and purposes the property of their husbands. The ideal Jewess was the good housewife. In religion also their position was definitely inferior to that of the men. They were not recognized as members of the congregation but were expected to perform certain religious rites and give honor to the Torah. Family life was definitely monogamous. Marriage and divorce were not public matters.

There were various opportunities for social expression in the villages of Palestine. The various feasts and celebrations afforded many chances to have fellowship one with the other. The Jew then and now was a social creature.

Chapter VIMoral and Religious Life in Palestine

To the Jew, religion and secular living could not be separated. All of his education was essentially religious. The Jew was first the faithful of Jehovah and second a citizen of the state. They were racially a unit for the nature of their religion made them so. This was true in Jesus' day, it is also true in our twentieth century civilization. These things must be taken into consideration in any discussion of the moral and religious life of the Palestine of Jesus' day.

The Temple and its Priesthood.

The Temple at Jerusalem was the center of Jewish religious life as was the synagogue in the smaller towns. Thousands of people went to the capitol city and its temple every year for the feast of the Passover. From an architectural point of view the temple must have been striking, for today the great open area on which it stood impresses the tourist who passes it. There is, of course, difficulty in attempting to visualize the temple of 1900 years ago, but its general plan can be deduced from a careful observation of this area where it once stood. The building itself stood in a space which was formed from a huge sub-structure of masonry and the entire temple area was surrounded by a huge wall. Within this were the courts broken up into a

series of concentric plots, each a few steps higher than the other. The entire area encompassed somewhat over 26 acres. On two sides of the Court of the Gentiles, beyond which only Jews could pass, was the magnificent royal Porch which was erected by King Herod. It consisted of four rows of marble columns. Beyond this court was a great area which was separated by a stone balustrade, the other side of which was a high wall which could in case of necessity turn the entire structure into a fortress. This wall was pierced by nine gates and passing through one of them the enquirer came into the court of the women. Beyond this was the Court of Israel which gave way to the Court of the Priests, in the midst of which was the altar of burnt offering. Immediately behind the altar was the temple proper in which were a vestibule, the Holy Place, and the Holy of Holies. The altar was built of marble and was about 100 to 150 feet high. Within the temple were offered daily sacrifices for national sin and the offerings in connection with the festivals. Its ritual was highly developed and as the people believed came from Jehovah himself. The maintenance of the temple was one of the requirements of the Jewish law which all Jews honored.

The outer court of the temple was often filled with animals for sacrificial purposes, sacrifices which were practically continuous throughout the day. They included morning and evening burnt offerings for the nation, for the Emperor. They also included trespass, sin and thank offerings for individuals. In addition to these there were

numerous oblations for the removal of ceremonial impurity.

The services of the temple included prayers and music conducted by the Levites. On feast days the service was more elaborate and ritualistic, and they were attended by thousands of Jews who came to the city from all parts of the Roman Empire.

The Priests, descendants of Aaron, were definitely assigned for stated periods of service. They were given support in a variety of ways: a portion of the offerings were given to them, dues were also levied upon crops and the first fruits of the harvest. Tithes were also paid into the temple treasury, a portion of which went towards the upkeep of the temple and a portion to the priests.

The temple itself was supported by a tax of a half-shekel which was paid by every male Jew. This tax came from the Jews all over the Empire and it amounted to huge sums in the course of time.

The Synagogue and its Uses.

The origin of this Jewish institution is uncertain. They could be found everywhere in Palestine at the beginning of the first century of the Christian era and were probably the natural outgrowth of the intense Jewish desire to learn and know the Law. They were at first centers of religious instruction and later places of worship. No material sacrifices were made in the synagogues. They were voluntary associations and could be formed by a minimum of ten male members. The worship service was very informal, consisting



of the recitation of Deuteronomy 6:4-9 which was regarded as a creed by the Jews. The whole congregation said the Shema followed by some prayers given by a person called "the deputy of the congregation." After this a lesson was read from the Pentateuch and one from the Prophets. These lessons were read in Hebrew which most of the people did not understand. After this a sermon was given or rather the scriptures were expounded. The preacher was not always the same person, anyone had the right to explain the scriptures. The service concluded with the benediction of Numbers 6:24-26 pronounced either by a priest or a layman.

Religious Beliefs of Groups within Judaism.

There were four distinct parties within Judaism; namely, the Zealots, Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees. These groups thought alike on certain issues but also had beliefs in which they differed radically.

The Zealots were a party of young enthusiasts with a deadly hatred for Rome and the rule of the Herodian party. They were the finest patriots that Israel knew from the time of the Maccabees to the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. They were ever present forces in the rebellions that arose from time to time against the domination of Rome and the injustices of the house of Herod. They were, in fact, simply active and extreme Pharisees, who added to their love for the written and oral law of God the duty of protecting it with the sword. "These were the most wonderful warriors of Israel, inflamed alike by a political and

religious idea, and even by a great social-economic idea; but they arrived at an extremist position and wished to realize what was not yet possible for that generation: the time was not fitting for them that they should go forth as conquerors in a war against mighty Rome."¹⁹ It is most certainly this group, to whom the gospel writer refers when he says: "And from the days of John the Baptist and till now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." (Mt. 11:12) This is written in opposition to those who sought to bring the kingdom of heaven into being by the power of the sword. As the Zealots were fundamentally Pharisees they gave their enthusiastic adherence to any wonder worker who might hasten the coming of that kingdom, thus it was possible for a Zealot to be a disciple of Jesus, for during the earlier stage of his ministry it seemed as if he was a political-spiritual Messiah. Among the twelve disciples was one, Simon the Zealot. Judaism owes much to this group of young radicals, but for them and their persistent agitation Palestine might have become merely another Roman province and the unity which is the pride of Judaism would not have come to be the important tenant of the faith as it is today. No namby-pamby passive resistance was theirs, no other-worldly dreams would satisfy them. If the kingdom were to come at all, they would help to hasten it along. They were in truth, men of action; they did big things.

The Essenes were a group which lived in the

villages of Palestine for the most part, although some of them dwelt in the larger cities, for in Jerusalem is found a "Gate of the Essenes." In the villages, they had common dwelling places and held all property and produce in common. No one could enter their group without first serving a year of probation, after which the rites of purification were performed. Then they served two years more as probationers after which they were admitted to the group under oath to conceal nothing from their fellow Essenes. They also promised not to reveal any of the secrets of the group to non-Essenes. A member could be dismissed by authority of a court of 100 members. This dismissal amounted to social death.

In charge of each community was the treasurer whom the members were to obey without question. All money was in a common fund; property brought into the group by new members became the possession of the group under the supervision of the treasurer. All agricultural produce brought to the group was turned over to the special officers for distribution. All the members shared alike in the fruit of their labors. Their fundamental rule was to live on the results of their own labors; to live at peace and renounce all things that might influence others for evil. The majority did not marry that they might be kept free from uncleanness and undisturbed in the worship of God. Some of them did marry but only to propagate their membership. They also brought up children of parents sympathetic to Essenism, or orphans, which they trained in

the principles of the group. They sent gifts to the temple, and recognized its efficacy but not the blood-sacrifices which were a fundamental part of Hebrew worship.

They followed a strict daily routine; prayer before dawn followed by work. All ate breakfast together which was especially prepared by selected priests in order that the food might be ritually clean. The meal finished they returned to their work. At evening they had the second and last meal of the day.

Besides the name of God the Essenes also revered the name of Moses and anyone who blasphemed his name by act or word was put to death. They believed in unrestricted divine providence, predestination, and with it the limiting of free choice. They believed in the survival of the soul but not in a physical resurrection. A theory was held that souls were attracted by sensual love from the ether to this lower world where they were shut up in prison, only to find release when freed from the body. Good souls lived in a region where there was no snow, rain or excessive heat, evil souls in a region dark and foreboding.

The Essenes had their sacred writings regarding angels, secret medicinal remedies from roots, and all entrants into the Essenic fellowship must promise not to divulge the secrets of these writings or reveal the names of their special angels. There is some foundation for the theory that the Book of Enoch, which has much to say about

these things is of Essene origin. "Essenism might be described as a great human-national vision. It embodied in a remarkable way the moral socialism of the Prophets: it was the first social Utopia. Whereas the system of the Zealots was a socialism imposed by violence, a species of Bolshevism on its negative side, Essenism embraced all the positive characteristics of socialism: equality, community of possessions, opposition to bloodshed even in sacrifices, and, above all, labour and manual work."²⁰ Their's was an asceticism but not in an exaggerated form, for Essenism was so nationalistic and Jewish that it could not separate itself from the world of Judaism. The Essenes suffered with the nation and fought with it despite their aversion to blood-shed. They were first of all Jews and any force which threatened their freedom was an enemy to be overthrown, but this more violent type of activity was not a part of their natural outlook on life.

There is in Christianity much of Essenism, but John the Baptist came nearer to their principles of living than did Jesus. James the brother of Jesus lived as an Essene and favored asceticism. Jesus in his teachings did have certain points of resemblance with this sect. The effort to save the soul by complete denial of self, the ideas of eschatology and mysticism, and above all the sociological ideas which attracted the people to him, are more or less similar to the principles of the Essenes. This is not to say, however, that Jesus was affected by this

group but rather, both he and the Essenic followers were influenced by the thoughts of the time. Dr. Klausner and others seem to think that Jesus received some of his ideas from contacts with the Essenes but the facts do not seem to justify this conception.

The Pharisees were the popular party, the representatives, nominally at least, of the middle classes. Unlike the Essenes they held that all was not predestined. Divine providence guided the destinies of all men yet they were permitted the quality of free choice, a freedom that was itself a divine decree. The Pharisees preserved the tradition of the race, and in the maintenance of that tradition they formulated laws not included in the Torah, laws that would meet the demands of their day. They were outstanding for their high ethical and moral standards and their aloofness from the pleasures of life. They believed in the survival of the soul and a system of rewards and punishments after death. They were strict legalists and literalists and did not always live as they taught and this formed the basis for the bitter denunciation of them by Jesus. His denunciation, however, was not against the beliefs or the system but against those who were misusing their important office and thus belittling the Law which they professed to uphold.

Pharisaism did possess one outstanding defect, it was far more concerned with the discussion of the commandments dealing with man's relationship to God

than it was with the principles which had to do with man's relationship to man. These latter, they felt to be necessary for one's right relationship to God, but they ignored the application of them in daily living. The difficulty lay then in the comparative relationship between the ceremonial and ethical laws. To the orthodox Pharisee, the desecration of the Sabbath and the oppression of their fellowmen were alike crimes punishable, but the former was much more important in their thinking. It inevitably followed from such a conception that the common people assumed that the value of morality was less than that of religion. This led of course to injustice and inhumanity, and was the fundamental reason for Jesus' opposition to the Pharisaic leaders of his day. His opposition was not to the ceremonial law as such, but rather he objected to the placing of the one above the other. He was not essentially transcending the law in this respect, but rather interpreting it aright. The Pharisaic teaching despite the antagonism of Jesus toward some of its proponents remains the basis for much of early Christian teaching.

The Sadducees were the priestly party, descendants of Zadok and the spiritual heirs of the Hellenists. What information we have regarding them comes from their opponents and the fact that no indubitable document is extant from Sadducean sources would seem to indicate that the party had no deep roots in the nation. The only document of any importance is the First Book of Maccabees and it is not entirely of Sadducean origin, although it does

redound in praises for their party. It can be learned from Josephus that the Sadducees denied predestination as well as any divine influence of God upon man's activities either good or bad. Man alone is responsible for his happiness or misfortune. They denied the efficacy of the Oral Law, the tradition of the fathers, and recognized only the Written Law. They taught that the soul died with the body and thus there was no resurrection of the dead, nor any system of rewards and punishments after death. In the administration of justice they were noted for their harsh punishments. The teachings of the Sadducees were accepted only by the few, in the main, the officials and the wealthy. With the exception of the first point, the disbelief in predestination, these statements from Josephus are confirmed by the Talmud and the Midrash. The New Testament also tells of their denial of the resurrection of the dead and of their belief in the existence of angels and spirits. (Matthew 22:23)

The one statement of Josephus which is doubtful is the one relative to divine providence. If the Sadducees acknowledged the authority of the Pentateuch, the Writings, and the Prophets, it would have been impossible for them to deny the principle of divine providence as it so permeates the literature of the Old Testament. Josephus' remark must be understood rather to refer to God's providence concerning individuals not the nation. God supervises his world and his people as a whole but has nothing to do with individual destiny.

The Sadducees were in direct opposition to the Pharisaic class over matters of ceremonial requirements. A discussion of these differences seem to us today to be superficial and unimportant, but this was not the case in Jesus' day. These difficulties undoubtedly arose over their respective attitudes toward the oral and the written Law. The Pharisees upheld both, the Sadducees claimed the written Law as supreme. Any action which the Law did not cover, the Sadducees acted upon in accordance with their own desires. They were in a very real sense true literalists according to the requirements of the Pentateuch.

Jesus and his disciples were not the ruling class and were little affected by the Sadducees. The fact that they denied the resurrection and did not develop the messianic ideas prevalent in his day would have alienated him against them. Unconsciously Essenism was the strongest influence upon him, while the most conscious influence was that of Pharisaism, the opposition to which brought Christianity into being.

Beliefs of Judaism as a Whole.

After a discussion of the beliefs of the various parties in Judaism it naturally follows that the principles of the Jewish faith should be considered. One thing must be kept in mind; to the Jews religion and morality could not be separated. The Jewish religion was and is today a high and lofty one. An adequate understanding of it is necessary if Jesus is to be properly understood.

Theirs was a lofty and noble conception of God. The Jews did not mention the name of God because of their intense reverence for Him. The priest alone on the day of Atonement expressed the name of the deity. They had a belief in the divine presence within their lives, or Shekima, a term borrowed from the temple where the Lord chose "to cause his name to dwell." This presence was as it were a light from the godhead which light could approach man as the agent of the godhead. Angels were also mediums between the two worlds, and they are emissaries of the godhead. They believed also in the presence of devils and evil spirits and the Gospels tell us of the demons and evil spirits that Jesus cast out from the bodies of the afflicted.

The majority of the people believed in Divine providence and in a system of rewards and punishments after death along with this went belief in the resurrection of the dead.

One of the characteristic and most important beliefs of the Jews was that of the Messiah that was to come to release them from the bondage of their oppressors and set up a Kingdom which would supplant all other kingdoms of this earth. The type of kingdom which it was to be, the manner of its coming and the time of its advent were principles which admitted of a great variety of opinion, but all of them agreed on the fact of the expectation. The Zealots sought to hasten the coming by the use of force. The Sadducees, who were least bound by this belief, nevertheless, believed it because it was contained with the

scriptures which they honored. They disbelieved in all of the post-biblical accretions which had developed since the formation of the Old Testament Canon and washed their hands of any theories which would lead them into a position of opposition to the political government under which they lived. To the Essenes, the coming of the Messiah was more of a mystical conception and bound up with an idea of social equality, purity, righteousness and worship. The Pharisees attempted to keep the belief in a Messiah from lapsing into a mere ideal far removed from the practical facts of life. They taught that its fulfillment was unquestioned but it was not their duty to attempt to hasten its coming, nor to abandon themselves to some miracle worker who might bring them into opposition with the government and bring disaster upon their nation.

Summary of Moral and Religious Life in Palestine.

The temple was the center and source of all Jewish worship and ceremony. Its services were administered by the priests, who were supported by the offerings and tithes of the people. Its upkeep was maintained by a universal tax upon every male Jew in all parts of the empire. The priests were definitely assigned for stated periods of service and were descendants of Aaron.

The Synagogues in almost every town in Palestine shortly after the time of Jesus were at first centers of religious instruction but later came to be houses of worship. They were always the center of religious activity

in the community.

There were four distinct groups within Palestine; namely, the Zealots, Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees. The Zealots sought to hasten the emancipation of their people by force, the Essenes fostered a communal brotherhood based on righteousness and moral equality. The Pharisees represented the masses of the people and the Sadducees were found among the ruling classes and the wealthier people. They agreed with each other on many points and disagreed on others. Particularly was this so in the case of the Pharisees and Sadducees. All of these groups were active in Jesus' day.

Judaism's faith is in one God who watches providently over the destinies of his believers. He communicates with men through the spirit, and the angels who are his emissaries. The Jews were all possessed with one central expectation, that of a Messiah or deliverer who was to come and bring them release and establish the kingdom of Heaven on earth. The method of this coming, its time and form encouraged a great variety of ideas, but that the deliverer was to come no one doubted. It now becomes, the task of this thesis to determine, if possible, how Jesus' teachings were effected by the thought world of his day.

BOOK III Jesus in His Day and Ours.Chapter VIISignificance of His Teachings.

Jesus came preaching a Kingdom of God. What was the nature of that kingdom? Where was it to be? When was it to come? These are questions for which an answer must be found. It is definitely clear what the evangelists thought about these questions and what they felt that Jesus understood about them, but it is not altogether clear just what Jesus felt and said about them. In the background of all the discussion that is follow, lies the whole problem of eschatology. A question that will have to be considered as it so clearly effected the thinking and the teaching of Jesus.

The phrase "Kingdom of God," or "Kingdom of Heaven," does not appear very often before the Christian era, although the idea appears to be perfectly familiar to the people of Jesus' day and needed little explanation. When he spoke of the kingdom as coming, all Jews expected some change which would be for the better. There were however, a great variance of ideas, relative to the process by which it would be realized. Some held the idea that it would be brought about by military force, others believed that God without the aid of men would come in some cataclysmic way and set up his kingdom on this earth. Still others held that it would come through the united effort for righteousness on the part of every individual.

Alongside of this expectation of the Kingdom was the conception of the Messiah, the "Anointed One", the "Christos." The great King in this Kingdom of God was to be the Messiah. It is possible however, to separate the Messianic expectation from the idea of the advent of the Kingdom. There were those in Jesus' day who thought that God was to be the king and would anoint no one to rule for him. The ideas relative to the nature of this Messiah, as to when he would come, as to whom he would save, were as varied as were those relative to the kingdom. There were however, two general types of expectation; the "Son of David" and the "Son of Man" types. The conception of the Messiah as the "Son of David" with which the Psalms of Solomon, written about fifty years before Jesus, abound was held by many Jews. Some descendent of the house of David would be the Messiah. The Psalmist recognized that God was king over all and that his kingdom was everlasting, but he believed that God had chosen David as an under-king and promised him that his kingdom would not cease. He prays that God will raise up a king a "Son of David" who will be their deliverer. There is no record of Jesus having thought himself to be the "Son of David" Messiah. The sections which precede the gospels of Matthew and Luke are an attempt to justify this conception, but are pretty clearly the work of the author, or of a redactor writing at a later time.

The second of these types is that exemplified in the term "Son of Man." This idea is prevalent in the Book of Enoch where the "Son of Man" has been with God al-

ways and is called the "Anointed." He is chosen by God to break in upon the earth and perform Messianic functions, such as the overthrow of all oppressors and a transformation of the world into one of peace and equality for all.

It is clear then that there was a wide variety of opinions relative to the Kingdom of God and to the Messianic ideal. They all agreed that the coming of the kingdom was to be a time of release and a realm in which ideals would be realized. The conception of the Messiah was necessarily linked with the idea of the kingdom. More or less common to all classes of society who possessed the expectation were three dominant ideas: the triumph of righteousness, the political supremacy of Jews, and the realization of this through the activities of the Messiah. These were the expectations among the people of Jesus' day. What did he believe about this kingdom? What phase of the eschatological thought of the time did he adopt?

In Mark 11:1 we find these words, "Verily I say unto you, there are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come with power." This definitely raises our question. How did Jesus expect the kingdom to come? How soon did he expect it to occur? The quotation from Mark would seem to indicate that Jesus expected it to come soon and other passages of the same nature bolster up this contention. Were these the actual words of Jesus or were they the work of the Gospel writer, writing at a later date? This is a minor question compared to the one of the Kingdom.

Its coming was the supreme thing, the nature of its coming or the time of its advent is of lesser importance. But it is well to know just what Jesus thought about it.

It is clear that the early Christians among whom the Synoptic writers worked expected the end to be sudden. In unequivocal terms they ascribe this view to Jesus. It was inevitable that the early Christians should expect this sudden and miraculous coming. The world had been created by the fiat of God, as their scriptures recorded, it was not unnatural to think that it would be regenerated also by a fiat of God. But did Jesus actually hold this view? One thing is certain, that in so far as our gospel records are concerned he never refuted it. The conception of the coming of the kingdom was so universal that it would be surprising if Jesus did not hold it. His references to the nature of its advent seem clearly to point to its nearness. Jesus undoubtedly conceived of it as not far off, in fact, it might even come in the life-time of those who were listening to his teaching.

Along with the question as to when the kingdom would come goes the dual one of the nature of its coming. How would the kingdom come, gradually or in a sudden and cataclysmic way? It is evident that many of the first century Christians felt that it could come in a miraculous way through the instrumentality of the power of God. Jesus also appears to have believed this. But Jesus is recorded in other passages as having said, "the Kingdom of God is in your midst." (Luke 17:3) How account for the seemingly

contradictory nature of these two conceptions? At first glance they do appear to be contradictory but in reality they are two phases of the same experience. The kingdom had already come in the hearts of those who were truly sons of God. They were continuing to prepare themselves for the establishment of a universal kingdom which was to be set up in some sudden and cataclysmic way. The kingdom was then both here and now, and was to come at a later time. Both of these conceptions seem to have been in the mind of Jesus. They are parts of the eschatological thinking of the day. Most modern scholars accept his explanation for the seemingly contradictory passages relative to the nature and the time of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

Was Jesus teaching then an interim ethic? That is, was his only concern for the immediate coming of the kingdom and the preparation of the people of his day for its advent? Without doubt his teachings were for those who were preparing themselves for the kingdom that was soon to come. This being true, then what value can his teaching have for today? These questions raise a truly vital problem in New Testament study. The chief proponent of the principle of "interim ethics" is Albert Schweitzer. To him the teachings of Jesus were only for the people of his day who honestly desired to prepare themselves for the coming of the kingdom. They were "counsels of perfection." The acceptance of this theory is dependent upon the approval of another of Dr. Schweitzer's that Jesus was a thoroughgoing eschatologist. That is, Jesus thought entirely in

terms of the eschatological thinking of his day. The fallacy in Dr. Schweitzer's argument lies in his basic assumption that all of the ideas relative to the coming of the kingdom and its nature, were uniform. We have seen that this is not the case, as the eschatological conceptions of Jesus' day allowed for a variety of opinions. The theory of Dr. Schweitzer grew up as a reaction to the tendency of many modern Christians to modernize the person of Jesus. He has attempted to get back to the true person of Jesus and to interpret the Man of Nazareth and his teachings in the light of their Palestinian background and Jewish thinking. In this endeavor he has rendered a great service to New Testament study.

If we accept this theory that Jesus' teachings were an "interim ethic" we become involved in some very real problems. If they were, than what value have they for our present age? Jesus expected the kingdom to come soon, it has not arrived. Then he must have been mistaken and his teachings have no value for the present day. This seems to be the very real fallacy in Dr. Schweitzer's theory. The answer would seem to lie in the dual conception of the nature of the kingdom. The Kingdom of God was already present in the minds and hearts of those who had accepted the principles of God as revealed by Jesus. His teaching was for them a preparation for the future coming of the Kingdom of God in all of its glory. In this sense then, his teaching is for us as well, a preparation for the coming of the Kingdom. Jesus was advocating an active

moral will which was to permeate the lives of the faithful. An active moral will which is just as vital and determinative for the Christian today as it was for the followers of Jesus. He taught his followers in order to prepare them for the kingdom and in that sense his teachings were an "interim ethic." They were more than that, they were principles which all believers in God and Jesus must accept in anticipation of the Kingdom that is yet to come. Jesus spoke in eschatological terms but put a new content into them. His teachings then are as vital and essential for us today as they were nineteen hundred years ago. The principles that he laid down were the foundation of a new social order which was to come into being at a future time. In that order, all men were to live at peace and in harmony with one another, all evil deeds were to be no more, all men would love and serve and do the will of God.

"A summary of the evidence then shows that the chief feature of Jesus' experience was his sense of the presence of God within him, producing his clear vision of religious and ethical values and making him feel the responsibility of unique leadership in establishing these values in the life of the nation and the world. The Jewish idea of "the Kingdom of God," a Jewish world empire, was the mould in which this unique experience was naturally cast. The idea of the cataclysmic end of the present age was a feature of this mould, and this idea Jesus accepted. He had, however, such profound present experience of these great religious and ethical realities that, as his conscious-

ness of unique Messianic leadership developed, he finally felt himself to be carrying the kingdom with him as an unostentatious present fact as well as a future cataclysmic expectation. The time of this solemn future event he did not find God revealing to him, but it seemed to him so near as to call urgently for immediate action on the part of his own generation."²¹ What then did Jesus teach that man must do in preparation for the Kingdom? What were the qualities that mankind must acquire if he was to be received into this kingdom?

First of all, the righteousness of mankind would introduce the kingdom. Men must therefore prepare themselves for its advent. An inner experience with God was the dominant feature of the change in human life which must be brought about. It was this inner experience of God that helped Jesus to again and again meet the crises of his life. This inner personal experience caused him to know and do only one thing - the "will of God." This determination to do the "will of God" was the definite outgrowth of his inner experience, it must be the principle underlying the idea of righteousness. Righteousness then, was primarily an inner experience and not the keeping of some external laws; it was a matter of the heart. The fundamental principles of sincerity, honesty, love and service must become central in the deeds and thoughts of those who were preparing themselves for the kingdom. The true son of God must have a love that looked not only

God-ward but manward as well. It is this principle that Jesus laid down when he gave the two great commandments. "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all they heart, with all thy mind, with all thy soul, and thy neighbor as thyself." Luke 10:27. True love involves repentance for man cannot love his brother unless he first repent of all the evil he has wrought and make restitution for all injustice he has done.

A second principle which men must acquire if they are to be ready for the kingdom, is the willingness to serve. It is man's willingness to serve his fellowmen and thus serve God, which makes him great. The Gospels are full of passages which indicate this truth. "He who would be greatest among you must be your servant," are the words that ring out as a challenge to higher living. "Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you." Mt. 7:12 has become the motto for many institutions of life. The principle of service is fundamental in all of Jesus teaching. It is the basis of all true Christian living. It is the principle which will help to eliminate much of the difficulty which faces our competitive civilization today. The Gospel of Luke is distinctly social in its emphasis and its implications. This principle of service becomes the essential quality in a new social order that is to come with the advent of the Kingdom.

Another requirement of those who are to make themselves ready for the Kingdom is that of loyalty to the

person of Jesus. At first this loyalty was not demanded because he believed himself to be the Messiah, that came later, but loyalty to himself as the leader of a great movement of righteousness.

This was the fundamental teaching of Jesus, a kingdom which was to come in the near future in some miraculous way. Man must prepare himself for the coming of that kingdom. In so far as man had accepted the will of God as his guide in life, he was already in the Kingdom of God. Its coming upon the earth would be brought about by the fiat of God and the establishment of the rule of righteousness upon the earth. Such an ideal Jesus found absolutely unattainable in society as it was constituted. Before the kingdom of righteousness could be realized men must follow a difficult path in preparation for it. "Those who longed for it must abstain from many of the good things of life and must suffer without limit at the hands of the wicked. And the wicked also would suffer endless woes of their own making, for there must of necessity intervene a complete reversal of present conditions, which were wholly evil, the exact antithesis of God's will. The proud must be humbled, the wicked must be put out of their places of power, the rich must be shorn of their riches, for pride that scorned one's fellows, wealth selfishly enjoyed, and power unjustly exercised were the chief blights on individual character and the chief sources of social evil. This overturning of the present constitution of society,

this complete reversal of conditions, was the great hope of Jesus. The certainty that it was soon to take place was the dominant note of his preaching. The glad tidings that God's reign was soon to replace the present reign of evil was the central theme of his message."²²

Specific Teachings of Jesus

What did Jesus have to say regarding the political, economic and social conditions of his day? Are these teachings practical and usable in our modern day?

The Palestine of Jesus' day was one of political unrest and dissatisfaction with the Roman regime. True, conditions were much better during the early life of our Master, than they had been in the years of seething revolt under the Maccabees and the Jews were in a much happier condition than they had been under the despotic Herod, but, regardless of this fact the Jews were still a subject nation and they lived in protest against all those conditions which interfered with their political and national freedom. The comparative calm of Jesus' day was but the forerunner of an even greater outburst which was to culminate in the destruction of Jerusalem. Living then in a civilization so full of unrest and associating with people who were victims of political unrest and whose lives were burdened with an excessive taxation paid to a heathen nation; what did Jesus have to say regarding the attitude which the people should have toward Rome? What in general did he say toward the institutions of Government? How did

the political and civil principles under which the Jews lived affect his teachings regarding the Kingdom ideal? Jesus must have had something to say regarding the political situation of his day for he could not very well fail to sense the burdens under which his people were groaning. From his teachings on these issues an attempt will be made to apply them, if possible to the difficulties of our modern day.

In the Realm of Politics.

Much of the thinking of the Jews of Jesus' day relative to a release from the bondage of Rome was centered in the expectation of the coming of a Messiah who would overthrow their enemies and set up a kingdom in which the Jews would be supreme. It was a political kingdom with which they concerned themselves. This Messiah was to be the King. Jesus must have been aware of this wide-spread conception and of its acceptance by many of the people of his day. Jesus had come to realize that this conception was not in accord with the Divine plan of God for the Jews. He had formulated a different conception of the Kingdom. It was not to be a political but a spiritual and moral order of society. What then did he have to say regarding the attitude of his people toward Rome? How did the conditions in Palestine which affected him and his people coincide with his ideal of the Kingdom of God?

Nowhere in his teachings does he give a systematic statement with regard to politics. His primary concern was

not with the political relationships of his people. They were, it is true, subjected to Roman power, but their primary loyalty was not to the state but to their God. His attitude towards the state and its political institutions is recognized, if at all, in the scattered sayings and general comparisons of his teaching. It is evident that he obeyed the local and imperial government under which he lived for we have no record of any conflict between himself and Rome, save that of his trial before Pilate. Here the Jews accused him of preaching against Rome, of claiming to be the King of the Jews. Pilate inquired of him, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" Jesus answered and said, "Thou sayest." Pilate and Herod upon further examination, according to our gospel record, found nothing politically dangerous in Jesus and offered to release him. His kingship was not of this world and the attempts of his enemies to involve him in political difficulties were of no avail.

Jesus definitely put down all ideas of kingship which arose among his disciples and followers. It is of course true that he was not concerned with politics and that this accounts for the scarcity of any teaching regarding Rome, but there was also a recognition of the necessity and the rightful claims of the state. Any emphasis which he might have placed upon the duty of the citizen to take part in public affairs would have served to arouse those who were thinking in terms of political independence.

He plainly recognized that any open political act would force him into a position of political leadership which would be absolutely fatal to his principle of the Kingdom of God, for it would bring him into conflict with Rome and his whole cause would be lost. In speaking of the duties of men, therefore, he carefully avoided all reference to public political obligations, but laid great emphasis upon the duty of the individual to his fellow men. Indirectly, he counseled them to pay their taxes and to "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesars" (Mt. 22:18-22)

This is the most direct statement that our gospels contain relative to his attitude toward Rome. His answer to his enemies regarding the tribute money was the refutation of an attempt on their part to cause him to become involved with Rome. It is an avoidance of a definite teaching rather than the enunciation of a principle, but none the less it portrays his attitude toward the state. His primary concern was not with Rome, nor should his hearers worry themselves overmuch about the state, their citizenship was elsewhere. They should, however, as subjects of Rome honor their duties and obligations, if they would avoid conflict with the state and thus bring destruction upon themselves.

Jesus was not a socialist, a communist, a proponent of democracy as some of our modern day protagonists of these systems would like to make him, for He was not concerned with any type of political system. If men

desire today to find sanction in Jesus for any form of government, they must first appeal not to specific sayings, but to the spirit which is the basis of the ideal order as conceived by Jesus. The test of any order or system of government lies in the one fundamental principle. Does it make for that fraternity that is Jesus' ideal for society? If it does, we can be sure that Jesus would have approved of it. A government is Christian, not because it is of this or that type, but because it is in accord with the principles of love and brotherhood which must undergird any humanitarian political system.

What then is the nature of this Kingdom of God with which all political systems must of necessity be in accord if they are to be Christ-like? The nature of that Kingdom as we have already discussed was primarily concerned with the proper relationship between Man and God, and the individual with his fellow men. Its fruition, Jesus may or may not have thought, was near at hand. Thus it was the task of every individual to bring his own life into such harmony with God that he would be assured a place in that Kingdom when it would come. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man were the basic cornerstones of that Kingdom. If man lived in right relationship with his brother and with his God, then the Kingdom had already come within his heart. The principles of brotherhood involving justice, mercy, love and understanding which are in a very real sense divine attributes, would then permeate all the

actions and thoughts of every individual and the Kingdom of God would be on its way.

Thus the political system which possesses the qualities which go to make up the Kingdom of God can be assured of the Divine blessing and of Jesus' sanction, in spite of the fact that he had nothing to say regarding anyone system. But, someone objects, no such government can exist, force and not love is the essential element of the state. "The only rational reply is one of doubt that is itself hope. For it may well be doubted whether the teachings of Jesus are not more operative in politics than men think; and it may well be hoped so long as this possibility lasts, that, as the conceptions of man and society and the family have more and more come under the sway of the thought of Jesus, so too politics are approaching, be it ever so slowly, that justice and altruism which are to be the world's when once its kingdoms have become the kingdom of the Lord and his Christ."²³

In the Realm of Social and Economic Living.

In the realms of economics and sociology we can glean much to serve as standards in our present day. Jesus himself, according to our records, was born of lowly estate in a family where poverty was always a grim and foreboding possibility. It was no miracle that Jesus spent the major part of his active ministry in service to the poor and the lowly, his sympathies were akin to theirs, the burdens that they were forced to assume were also his burdens.

In his day, as in ours, the rich were in positions of leadership and were constantly growing richer, oftentimes at the expense of others. Poverty was rampant, in truth, the major portion of the population were constantly facing the spectre of economic scarcity. Documentary evidence is lacking on these points, but from our study of the economic and social conditions of Jesus' day we can with surety deduce the facts of economic unrest and insecurity. Palestine was suffering under serious economic disadvantages under the Roman regime and her people were taxed to death. All able bodied male Jews had to pay a double tax, one to the ecclesiastical system and one to Rome. With large masses of people facing poverty and under the domination of Rome as well as the injustices of their own leaders, there was much room for dissatisfaction among the people, a dissatisfaction that was enhanced by the hopeless fact that there seemed to be no way out of the dilemma. All that appeared before them in the future was economic and social slavery. It was small wonder that there grew up the eschatological and apocalyptic ideas which play so great a part in the thinking of their day and the teaching of Jesus. The Man of Nazareth could not have failed to see the prevailing unjust conditions as well as suffered under them himself. His first and most natural reaction was to do what he could to ease their burdens, and bring about a change of heart if possible, in those who were causing the unfair situation.

Jesus came into this situation bringing a teaching of the Kingdom of God, which would be a time of release. His message was gratefully received by those less fortunate and for the most part scornfully ignored by the richer class. Now, if ever, the conditions were to right themselves and the poor would have an equal opportunity with the others. In this overthrow of Rome and the humbling of their own self-righteous leaders, which they had long expected, the long-suffering which they had endured would be made right. But this was not the conception of Jesus, whom many had come to look upon as the Messiah. He had definitely rejected, in the period of decision in the Wilderness, the temptation to set up a material kingdom. Nothing would be gained in the purely physical overthrow of the rich and the exaltation of the poor, for there would still remain wealth and poverty side by side. His thought of the kingdom was rather spiritual and in the realm of human values. He visioned a world brotherhood in which all men would have an equal opportunity and all would be true sons of God. A kingdom of righteousness was essentially the prophetic ideal, it was also that of Jesus. The principle rules for living within this kingdom were service and love. In a world facing the realities of starvation and suffering, this teaching sounded like the hopeless fancy of an idle dreamer to many of those who followed Jesus. This teaching of his, based on love and service to all, as over against the conception of

release through a political domination was too difficult for them to accept. It is too difficult today, for most so-called Christians to adopt. What did Jesus specifically teach regarding the possession of wealth, economic slavery which accompanies it, and the general social evils which are the product of it? Can the sayings and teachings which he uttered in his day be usable in our modern day? These are questions which we must attempt to answer, if Jesus is to mean anything to us today as a spokesman for social and economic justice.

"It would be, of course, unreasonable to expect him to legislate specifically for every new combination in the kaleidoscope of economic history. An itinerant preacher in Judea could hardly be expected to know of the great trade combinations of Alexandria and Rome, to say nothing of those economic changes through which the centuries were to pass. Even supposing that he had been able to foresee thus minutely the future, had Jesus attempted after the rabbinical fashion to draw up minute rules for the conduct of industrial life, he must needs have filled his brief career with toil that would have been as superfluous as incomplete. It is characteristic of genius to distinguish between the accidental and the essential in human experience. Judged by the same standard Jesus is the consummate genius, for there is no phase of generic human life with which he has not sympathy and to which his great principle of fraternity does not reach."

24

This statement of Shailer Matthews expresses a

fundamental principle which must be kept in mind. If we expect to find within the teachings of Jesus some specific saying regarding a specific evil or corrupt institution we are doomed to disappointment. What we will find is certain very definite principles of living which will make the existence of those evils impossible, if they are adopted. Jesus' criterion of judgment, relative to the worth of any system or institution was not "Is this thing good in itself?" but rather, "Does this thing make toward the realization of divine brotherhood?" This was his criterion, and in the pursuance of it, he laid down certain very definite principles of living. Perhaps the most outstanding question has to do with the accumulation of wealth and its uses. A clear understanding of his attitude in this matter, and the adoption of his principles into modern life will tend to clear up much of the existing difficulties which confront civilization today.

Jesus did not have the hatred for the rich that characterizes much of our Socialism and Communism today. He did not have the deep-seated aversion to riches that many of the Apocalyptic writers of his time seemed to have. He did not discriminate against them and refuse to have dealings with them. Indeed, he seems to have been as willing to help them as he was the less fortunate, if their attitude of mind was susceptible to his help. He heals the daughter of the rich Jairus as willingly as he performed

his other miracles. He was as willing to visit the house of the rich Pharisee as he was the home of the poorer man where he was accused of eating and having fellowship with publicans and sinners. He willingly accepted the hospitality of Zaccheus the rich tax-gatherer and was willing to commend him for his renunciation of his ill-gotten gains. But his attitude toward the rich was not one of servility, for his denunciation of them and of wealth is bitter and caustic. "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Mk. 10:23) "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." (Mark 10:23)

"Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." (Luke 12:15) "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust consume, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." (Mt. 6:19-20)

"Sell that which ye have and give alms:" (Luke 12:33)

"Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." (Luke 16:13) One of the most bitter and terrible parables of all is that of Dives and Lazarus. The rich man Dives goes to Hades as a matter of course, doubtless because he had misused his riches upon the earth. These and other teachings of Jesus, indicate the severity of the problem of riches and the uncompromising attitude of the teacher of Nazareth.

Can we assume that Jesus was unequivocally opposed to the possession of wealth? His condemnation of it would seem to indicate that this is the case. But the facts do not warrant any such conclusion. In the cases where rich men have been willing to make restitution for their thoughtlessness or sell all that they had and cling to the principles of the kingdom, Jesus has the highest of praise. The truth of the matter is, that wealth all too often blinds man to the finer things of life. He loses all else in the pursuit of wealth. The accumulation of wealth is the primary end in life. Thus wealth becomes an evil, and leads all too often to injustice and inhumanity. The possession of wealth is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. He who possesses it, has an increased responsibility for the welfare of others. It is the fact that wealth, all too often blinds it possessor to this increased responsibility that makes of it an evil. Wealth is therefore a desirable good only in so far as it contributes to a man's highest development. Wealth must be used for the establishment of that ideal social order in which all men are brothers, this is the only justification for its possession. The wealth and the things that it can buy are not of themselves evil, but if they are regarded as the highest good they will lead to selfish acquisition and man's inhumanity to man. "It is this danger which lies within wealth that Jesus especially warns men against. It is a simple matter of observation that instead of increasing

a man's social sympathies, the struggle for fortune too often makes him selfish and unsocial in that it breaks down that sense of dependence which the poor man feels binding him to other men. In the same proportion as the semblance of independence increases is there danger that a man will forget that he is always an integral part of society and that he can be truly a man only as he is dependent upon God and in sympathy with his fellows."²⁵

The accumulation of wealth and its uses was fundamentally to Jesus a moral matter. His eternal concern with all men was whether or not life was in accordance with the will of the Father. Wealth, has a tendency to subjugate life to the mere acquisition of material things and in that sense it is evil, but rightly used it becomes a great promotion agency for the Kingdom of God. He was the Son of all men, not the protagonist of a special group. He would not be universal if it could be proven that his definite outlook was towards one particular economic system or political regime, be it Socialism Communism, Democracy or what-not. His concern was with only one thing the proper relationship between God and man and the individual with his fellowman. No political or economic system is a panacea for all ills. Only that system will receive divine sanction which adopts and eternally fulfills the principles of brotherhood.

Conclusion

Jesus did not deal with many specific issues, such issues as we face in our complex civilization today, but he did lay down certain principles, which if adopted into our present structure of civilization, would transform it into that kingdom of God on earth, which Jesus expected and is yet to come. The fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man and all that those two fundamentals imply, if sincerely adopted and their principles of love, service, honesty and sincerity to God and man definitely applied, the Kingdom of God will come and His will will be done upon earth. That day has not yet come and as we believe today will not come in some cataclysmic and miraculous way, but an acceptance of and the practice of the teachings of Jesus, in so far as they are fundamental principles, can go a long way towards the creation of a better and a more Christian social order.

"We must constantly appeal to these great principles perfectly expressed in his own character and life, in our effort to secure proper industrial relations, thrifty provision for the rainy day and old age, the removal of causes of poverty and disease, the mastery of the physical world by scientific discovery and invention for the common good, the maintenance of law, order, courts, schools and all the other institutions of an honest and friendly world civilization. But such applications were not made in the teaching of Jesus. If they had been his teaching would have seemed

unreal and been out of vital contact with the situation in which he lived. It is hard to see how, under these circumstances, he and his progressive movement could have gained an historical footing in the life of the race."²⁶ But Jesus did lay down the principles which can make for the best of all worlds and the most humanitarian of all civilizations if we will but adopt them and use them today.

May we draw a picture of what would result in this civilization of ours if Jesus' principle of the right use of wealth were put into practice. Wars would be no more, for at bottom they are economic; industrial disputes would be a thing of the past, for right relationship would exist between employer and employee; poverty would be abolished, for all men would realize their responsibility one to the other; in truth, all of the evils which now dominate civilization due to economic injustice and unbalanced possession of wealth would be eliminated. An ideal picture, yes, but one that is in accord with the principles of Jesus. We are Christians and ostensibly followers of him, it is not only our obligation but our privilege to work for this ideal state. Faith in God and service to man, two of the cardinal teachings of Jesus, can lead to nothing else but an ideal society, if honestly and sincerely accepted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A History of the Jewish People
1900
Chas. Scribner's & Sons
Riggs, James S.
- The Books of the Apocrapha
1915
Robert Scott, London
Oesterley, W.O.E.
Pages 90-159
- New Archeological Discoveries
1917
Funk & Wagnalls
Cobern, Camden M.
Pages 3-131
- Ancient Times
Breasted, James H.
Ginn and Company
Pages 171-220
- New Testament Times in Palestine
1933 Revised
Macmillan Company
Matthews, Shailer
- The Social Teaching Jesus
1909
Macmillan Company
Matthews, Shailer
- The Life and Teaching of Jesus
1929
Macmillan Company
Bosworth, E. I.
Pages 23-28, 138-187, 243-256
- The Genesis of the Social Gospel
1929
Alfred A. Knopf
McCown, C. C.
Pages 292-356
- Jesus of Nazareth
1925
Macmillan Company
Klausner, Joseph
Pages 129-229
- Josephus, The Jewish Wars
1927
Wm. Heinemann Ltd., London
Thackeray, H. St.J.
editor
Books I-III

Bibliography (Continued)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Jesus Principles of Living | Kent, C.F. & Jenks, J.W. |
| 1920 | |
| Chas. Scribner's Sons | |
| The Life of Jesus | Holtzmann, Oscar |
| 1904 | |
| Adam and Chas. Black | |
| Jesus of Nazareth | Barton, Geo. A. |
| 1924 | |
| Macmillan Company | |
| The Story of Jesus | Bacon, B.W. |
| 1927 | |
| Century Company | |
| The Environment of Early Christianity | Angus, S. |
| 1915 | |
| Chas. Scribner's Sons | |
| The Religion of Jesus | Bundy, Walter E. |
| 1928 | |
| Bobbs-Merrill Co. | |
| Jesus Through the Centuries | Case, Shirley J. |
| 1932 | |
| University of Chicago Press | |
| Pages 1-17 | |
| Christianity and the Roman Government | Hardy, E.G. |
| 1925 | |
| Geo. Allen & Unwin Ltd. | |
| The Messianic Hope in the N. T. | Matthews, Shailer |
| 1905 | |
| University of Chicago Press | |
| Outlines of the Life of Christ | Sanday, W. |
| 1906 | |
| Chas. Scribner's Sons | |
| The Life and Times of Jesus | Edersheim, Alfred |
| | |
| Anson D. F. Randolph Co. | |
| Appendix IV | |
| What did Jesus Teach? | Graves, Frank P. |
| 1919 | |
| Macmillan Company | |

Bibliography (Continued)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| The Quest of the Historical Jesus | Schweitzer, Albert |
| 1910 | |
| Adam and Charles Black, London | |
| The Eschatology of the Gospels | von Dobschütz, Ernst |
| 1910 | |
| Hodder and Stoughton, London | |
| The Promise of His Coming | McCown, C. C. |
| 1921 | |
| Macmillan Company | |
| The Ethical Teaching of Jesus | Scott, E. F. |
| 1924 | |
| Macmillan Company | |

NOTES

1. From "Jesus Through the Centuries"- Shirley J. Case.
Page 1.
2. From "The Real Jesus" - Fiske & Easton - Pages 2-3.
3. From "The Genesis of the Social Gospel" - C.C.McCown.
Pages 39-40.
4. Ibid. Page 43.
5. Ibid. Pages 47-48.
6. From "Ancient Times" - James H. Breasted. Page 199.
7. From "The Life and Times of Jesus" - Alfred Edersheim.
Appendix IV Page 669.
8. From "Jesus of Nazareth" - Joseph Klausner - Pages 137-138
9. Ibid. Page 161.
10. Ibid. Page 167.
11. Ibid. Page 175.
12. From "New Testament Times in Palestine" - Shailer Mathews.
Pages 168-169.
13. Ibid. Page 196.
14. From "Jesus of Nazareth" - Joseph Klausner - Page 179.
- 15 & 16. Ibid. Page 182.
17. Ibid. Page 183.
18. Ibid. Pages 194-195.
19. Ibid. Pages 205-206.
20. Ibid. Page 210.
21. From "The Life and Teachings of Jesus" - E. I. Bosworth
Page 254.
22. From "The Genesis of the Social Gospel" - C.C.McCown.
Page 356.
23. From "New Testament Times in Palestine" - Shailer Mathews
Pages 130-131.
24. & 25. Ibid. Pages 134 and 146.
26. From "The Life and Teachings of Jesus" - E. I. Bosworth
Page 254

End of

The Jesus of history reinterpreted for today

Bound volume is continued by

A critical evaluation of the contributions of Professor
Benjamin W. Bacon to the interpretation of the fourth
gospel

Predestination and incarnation

The social and religious origins of the Negro Church

The contribution of the new physics to religious
thought

Search by above titles on archive.org to
continue reading this collection of Pacific
School of Religion Theses from 1935,
call number Thesis Cage 1935 v.4

